This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Per. 971 e. $\frac{126}{9}$

THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Quarterly Review.

Πύλαι ἅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς.—*Matt.* xvi. 18.

VOL. IX.

BIBLIOTECA

LONDON:

WILLIAM EDWARD PAINTER, 342, STRAND.

VINCENT, OXFORD; DEIGHTON, AND STEVENSON, CAMBRIDGE; MILLIKEN, DUBLIN; GRANT, AND LAING AND FORBES, EDINBURGH.

AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

MDCCCXL.

CONTENTS.

ART. PAGE.

I. THE PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION.

The Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration: sought for in Holy Scripture, and investigated through the medium of the Written Documents of Ecclesiastical Antiquity. By George Stanley Faber, B.D., Master of Sherburne Hospital, and Prebendary of Salisbury. 1

II. THE CHURCH AND THE NOVELISTS.

1 Preferment; or, My Uncle the Earl. By Mrs. Gore, Authoress of "Mrs. Armytage," "Stokeshill Place," &c. 3 vols.

2 The Prelate: a Novel. 2 vols. 33

III. DR. VAUGHAN AND THE USEFUL KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY.

The History of England under the House of Stuart, including the Commonwealth. (A.D. 1603-1688.) Part I. —James I., Charles 1. Under the Superintendence of the "Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge." . 52

IV. CARTHAGE AND HER CONSTITUTION.

1 Aristotelis Politicorum libri octo, edidit Carolus Goettling, Prof. P. E. in Univ. Lit. Jenensi.

2 Historical Researches on the Carthaginians, &c. By Professor Heeren.

3 History of Rome. By Thomas Arnold, D.D. Head Master of Rugby School. Vol. ii. 75

V. LADY HUNTINGDON'S LIFE AND TIMES: RELIGIOUS CHARACTERS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon. By a Member of the Families of Shirley and Hastings. 2 vols. 90

VI. THE SLAVE TRADE AND THE COLONIES.

1 The African Slave Trade and its Remedy. By Thomas Fowell Buxton, Esq. (now Sir T. F. Buxton, Bart.)

2 Travels in the West: Cuba, with notices of Porto Rico and the Slave Trade. By David Turnbull, Esq., M.A. Corresponding Member of the Royal Academy of History at Madrid, and of the Royal Patriotic and Economical Society of the Havannah.

3 Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords appointed to consider of the Petition of the East India Company for relief, and to report thereon to the House; with the minutes of evidence taken before the Committee, and an Appendix and Index. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 4th of June, 1840. . . 115

VII. Grammar Schools of England and Wales.

1 Observations on Grammar Schools, and the means of improving their condition, and extending their utility. By the Hon. Daniel Finch.

2 A Bill for improving the Condition, and extending the Benefits of Grammar Schools.

3 Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales. By Nicholas Carlisle, F.R.S. 137

VIII. On the Worship of the Virgin Mary as Practised in the Church of Rome.

1 First Series. Roman Fallacies and Catholic Truths. To which is prefixed a Narrative of the Conversions effected by St. Mary's Priory at Princethorpe, during the first five years of its establishment.....With an Appendix, containing answers to objections, and the authorities quoted, in the original languages. By the Rev. H. Townsend Powell, M.A., Vicar of Stretton-on-Dunsmore.

2 The Spirit of Popery: an Exposure of its Origin, Character, and Results, in Letters from a Father to his Children. Religious Tract Society.

3 The Book of Popery; a Manual for Protestants, descriptive of the Origin, Progress, Doctrines, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Papal Church. By Ingram Cobbin, M.A.

4 Speech of the Rev. John Cumming, M.A., at the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the British Society for Promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation, May 21, 1840.

5 Doctrine de l'Ecriture Sainte sur l'Adoration de Marie.

6 The Glories of Mary, Mother of God; translated from the Italian of Blessed Alphonsus Liguori, and carefully revised by a Catholic Priest: containing a beautiful paraphrase of the "Salve Regina."

7 The Little Testament of the Holy Virgin: translated from the French, and revised by a Catholic Priest.

8 Month of Mary; or Meditations for each day of the Month, calculated to inspire Devotion to the Mother of God, principally designed for the Month of May.

9 The Little Office of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, for the use of the Confraternity of the Sca-

pular, and of other devout Christians, in Latin, and a new English Translation by the Rev. F. C. Husenbeth.

10 The Catholic School-book; containing Easy and Familiar Lessons for the Instruction of Youth of both Sexes in the English Language, and in the paths of true Religion and Virtue. Twentieth edition, with additions.

11 The Family Prayer Book; containing all the Public and Private Devotions in use amongst English Catholics. . 166

IX. Poets of the Opening Decade.

1 The Works of the Rev. R. Montgomery. 6 vols.

2 The Cherwell Water Lily, and other Poems. By the Rev. Frederick William Faber, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford.

3 Recollections of the Lakes, and other Poems. By the Author of the "Moral of Flowers," &c.

4 Whisperings of Fancy, and other Poems. By the Rev. William Mark, B.A.

5 Joseph, a Poem. By Sir J. D. Paul, Bart., D.C.L.

6 Ruth, a Poem. By Sir J. D. Paul, Bart., D.C.L.

7 The Protestant Annual for 1841. Edited by Charlotte Elizabeth.

8 The Parlour Table-Book. Written and Edited by the Author of "Lives of the Sacred Poets."

9 Poetical Reveries. Translated from the French of M. de Lamartine, by the Rev. Henry Christmas, M.A., F.S.A. 203

ECCLESIASTICAL REPORT.

The Church in the Colonies; Education at Home; Church-Rates; New Churches; The State of our Older Churches; The Mayoralty; Her Majesty and the Princess Royal; Socialism and Chartism. 215

GENERAL LITERATURE.

Tracts of the Anglican Fathers. Vol. I. 231

The Five Empires, an Outline of Ancient History: Englishman's Library. By Robert Isaac Wilberforce, M.A. . . . 233

The History of the Jews from the taking of Jerusalem by Titus to the present time 233

The Churchman's Guide 233
The Whole Works of Richard Graves, D.D. 234
The Horæ Paulinæ of William Paley 239
A Verbal Paraphrase of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans . . 239
Biblical Cabinet 239
Narrative of a Three Months' March in India, and a Residence in the Dooab. By the Wife of an Officer in the 16th Foot . 240
The Hebrew Grammar of Gesenius. By T. I. Conant . . 242
Emendations of the Authorised Version of the Old Testament. By Selig Newman 242
The City of Magyar, or Hungary and her Institutions. By Miss Pardoe. 243
Christ's Discourse at Capernaum, fatal to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. By G. S. Faber, B.D. 248
The Parables of Jesus Explained and Illustrated. By F. G. Lesco 248
Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern. By J. L. Von Mosheim, D.D. 249
The Christian System Vindicated against the most specious Sophisms of Modern Infidelity. In 3 Parts. By the Rev. Daniel Moore, B.A. 250
An Introduction to the Evidences of the Divine Origin of the Christian Religion 250
The Works of Josephus. 250
The Illustrated Watts's Hymns. 250
The Life and Pontificate of Gregory VII. 251
The Book of Amusement. By Joseph Fearn. 251
Collier's Ecclesiastical History 251
The Life and Times of Montrose. By M. Napier, Esq. . . 252
An Historical Sketch of the Protestant Church in France. By the Rev. J. G. Lorrimer 252
An Index of Prohibited Books by command of the present Pope, Gregory XVI. By the Rev. J. Mendham, M.A., M.E.H.S. 252
Specifications for Practical Architecture, By A. Bartholomew. . 252
Geraldine, a Tale of Conscience. By E. C. A. 253
The Illustrated Commentary 253
Narratives and Tracts. Series of Children's Books . . . 253
Bible Stories. The Child and the Hermit. 253
Gregory VII. a Tragedy; with an Essay on Tragic Influence . 254
The Divine Economy of the Church. By the Rev. J. Jebb. . . 254
Iceland, Greenland, and the Faroe Islands. Edinburgh Cabinet Lib. 254

CONTENTS.

ART. PAGE

I. THE CHURCH AND THE WESLEYANS.

1. Records of Wesleyan Life. By a Layman.
2. The Centenary. By Thomas Jackson.
3. Wesleyan Methodism, Considered in Relation to the Church; to which is subjoined a Plan for their Union and more effectual Co-operation. By the Rev. Richard Hodgson, M.A., Evening Lecturer of St. Peter's, Cornhill 255

II. RANKE'S HISTORY OF THE POPES.

The Ecclesiastical and Political History of the Popes of Rome during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. By Leopold Ranke, Professor in the University of Berlin. Translated from the German by Sarah Austin. 3 vols. 301

III. THE PRINCIPLES OF POPULATION.

The Principles of Population. By A. Alison, F.R.S., &c. 322

IV. THOMAS A BECKET AND HIS COTEMPORARIES.

1. History of the Contest between Thomas à Becket and Henry II. Hussell Froude's Works. Second part. Vol. 2.
2. The Early English Church. By Edward Churton, M.A., Rector of Crayke, Durham 335

V. CHURCH PRINCIPLES.

1. Church Principles Considered in their Results. By W. E. Gladstone, Esq., late Student of Christ Church, and M.P. for Newark.
2. The Sermons of the Right Rev. Robert Sanderson, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. With a Life, by Isaac Walton; and an Introduction, by the Rev. Robert Montgomery, M.A., of Lincoln College, Oxford 381

ART. PAGE

VI. On the Worship of the Virgin Mary as Practised in the Church of Rome.

1. Primitive Christian Worship; or, the Evidence of Holy Scripture and the Church concerning the Invocation of Saints and Angels, and the Blessed Virgin Mary. By the Rev. J. Endell Tyler, B.D.
2. The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary Illustrated; or, a Critical Disquisition and Enquiry concerning the Genuineness of the Parody on the Psalms of David, commonly ascribed to St. Bonaventure; comprehending the First Fifty Psalms of the Psalter of the B.V.M., with Selections from the Remainder. By Robert King, A.B., S.T.C.D.
3. The New Month of Mary; or, Reflections for each Day of the Month, on the different Titles applied to the Holy Mother of God in the Litany of Loretto; principally designed for the Month of May. By the Very Rev. P. R. Kenrick.
4. Tributo Quotidiano di affetuosi Preghiere e Lodi per ciascun giorno della Settimana alla immacolata Madre di Dio, Madre di Misericordia e Rifugio di Peccatori, Maria SS. onde godere del materno suo patrocinio in ogni di della vita, e specialmente degli estremi bisogni della morte, tratte dalle opere del Seraf. D. S. Bonaventura, con breve e utilissimo indirizzo per assistere alla S. Messa, e visitare la Via Crucis, ed altre aggiunte. 419

VII. The Choephorœ of Aeschylus.

The Choephorœ of Aeschylus. With Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Philological. By the Rev. Thomas Williamson Peile, M.A., late Senior Fellow and Tutor in the University of Durham 429

VIII. Church Music.

1. A Collection of Chants. By Alfred Bennett, Organist of New College, Oxford.
2. Cathedral Selections. By Thomas Bennett, Organist of the Cathedral and St. John's Chapel, Chichester.
3. Twenty-four Chants. To which are prefixed some Remarks on Chanting. By Robert Gray.
4. The Psalter; arranged for Chanting. By William Jones, Organist of Ely Cathedral.
5. Tunes for Country Churches; more especially adapted to the Selection of Psalms and Hymns compiled by the (late) Rev. Thomas Webster, B.D., Cambridge.
6. The Psalm and Hymn Tunes used at St. John's Chapel, Bedford-row; arranged for Four Voices, and adapted for the Organ or Piano-forte, with appropriate Symphonies. By Theophania Cecil 452

ART. PAGE

IX. TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

1. Tracts for the Times, No. 90. Remarks on certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles.
2. A Letter addressed to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, in explanation of No. 90, in the Series called the "Tracts for the Times." By the Author.
3. A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, on the publication of No. 90, of the "Tracts for the Times." By William Sewell, M.A., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford 469

ECCLESIASTICAL REPORT.

The Printing of the Bible; Dissenting and Lay Baptism; The Pope and the Government System of Education; The Anglican Church; Schismatical Consecrations; Clerical Irregularities; Socialism; The Baptism of the Princess Royal; Episcopacy in the Colonies; Church Extension; Church Rates; Her Majesty's Speech at the Opening of the Session. 481

GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Rights of the Poor and Christian Almsgiving Vindicated; or, the State and Character of the Poor, and the Conduct and Duties of the Rich, Exhibited and Illustrated . . 500
Chaucer's Poems Modernized 500
Live while you Live 500
An Attempt to ascertain the True Chronology of the Book of Genesis 501
A Supplement to Dr. Sall's True Catholic and Apostolic Faith maintained in the Church of England, as recently republished with Notes 501
Scott's Bible. (New Edition) 501
Selections from the Proverbs and Book of Ecclesiastes, in English, French, Italian, and German 502
Sephardim; or, the History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal . 502
The Sermons of the Right Reverend Robert Sanderson, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Lincoln 502
A Selection from the Unpublished Papers of the Right Reverend William Warburton, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Gloucester. 503
A History of the Reformation on the Continent . . . 503
Letters to an Aged Mother 503

PAGE

John Huss. The Workings of Popery in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries 503
Summer Rambles and Winter Amusements 503
Life and Remains of the Rev. Robert Houseman, B.A. . . 504
My Life. By an Ex-Dissenter 504
Washington: an Essay. By M. Guizot 504
Sermons. By George Goodenough Lynn, M.A., Minister of St. John's Chapel, Hampton Wick 504
The Theory and Practice of Valuing Tithes 504
Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians. By John Calvin 505
Thoughts on Phrenology 505
Stories of the Animal World; arranged so as to form a Systematic Introduction to Zoology 505
Reasons for Conservatism 505
Alda, the British Captive 505
The Englishman's Library—
Charles Lever: the Man of the Nineteenth Century . 506
Scripture History. (New Testament). . . . 506
Tales of the Village. (Second Series). . . . 506
Abraham, the Father of the Faithful 506
The Centurion: Portraits of Roman Officers delineated in the New Testament 506
Anti-Popery; or, Popery Unreasonable, Unscriptual, and Novel. 506
The Latter Days of the Jewish Church and Nation . . . 507
A Brotherly Enquiry for "The Holy One of Israel." . . 507
Slavery, and the Internal Slave Trade in the United States of North America 507
Dreams and Dreaming 507
Ecclesia. A Volume of Poems 507
The Romance of Jewish History 508
The Works of Josephus 508
Fox's Book of Martyrs. By the Rev. J. Cumming, M.A. . 508
Ireland. By N. P. Willis 508
Helen Fleetwood: a Narrative 509
Pulpit Recollections; or, Miscellaneous Sermons preached in the Parish Church of Stoke-upon-Trent, Staffordshire . . 509
The Restoration of the Jews to their own Land, in its connection with their Conversion and the Final Blessedness of the Earth. 509
Home Discipline 509
Fasts and Festivals of the English Church 510
Collier's Ecclesiastical History 510
A Visit to the Indians of Chili 510
Prayers for Young Persons 510
What we are to Believe a Practical Explanation of the Creed, for the Use of Children 510
Lessons on the Liturgy. Compiled from various Authors. . 510
Nuces Philosophicæ; or, Philosophic Nuts 510
The Sunday Reader. By the Rev. J. E. Riddle, M.A. . . 510

THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Quarterly Review.

JANUARY MDCCCXLI.

ART. I.—*The Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration: sought for in Holy Scripture, and investigated through the medium of the Written Documents of Ecclesiastical Antiquity.* By GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B.D., Master of Sherburne Hospital, and Prebendary of Salisbury. London: Seeley and Burnside. 1840.

THE appearance of a work like this, in the present crisis of the Church's history, affords us matter of deep and fervent congratulation. Perhaps there never was a moment in which it was more needed—undoubtedly there never was one in which the subject treated of was more likely to meet with due attention, or in which the study of it was likely to result in greater practical benefit. The Church, thank God! is awake. A period of dull and leaden formality—of drowsy listlessness and inactivity, has given place to one of expansive zeal and energetic ardour, unparalleled, perhaps, since the days of the Reformation. If the emissaries of darkness be gathering up their powers for a more than ordinary struggle, the Church is no less busy in arming for the contest. The banner of the cross no longer droops half concealed and mouldering in dim and cloistered recesses, but, seized by many a vigorous hand, it unfurls itself majestically to the breeze, and flames meteor-like in the forefront of battle. On every side is heard the din of preparation: the sound of the armourer's hammer rings throughout the camp, and mingles with the stirring trumpet-summons which calls upon the hosts of the Lord to awake and put on strength, as in

the days of old. The question then is no longer so much one of action or inaction, as of the most effective means of action. The great majority are aroused—they are ready to use their arms; and the only enquiry is what are the proper weapons to employ, and how are they to be employed to the best advantage? Now it requires no extraordinary powers of observation to perceive that there are at present two lines of conduct held out to the Church by men alike well-intentioned as to their motives, but both having a tendency to run into injurious extremes—the one party disposed to yield, perhaps, a somewhat undue reverence to antiquity—the other inclined to reject the appeal to antiquity altogether, as savouring of a return to the justly-repudiated errors of Romanism, and as tending to "make the Word of God of none effect by tradition."

We can easily see how these two classes have originated, and whence the source of the respective extremes into which they have fallen. At a season of great sickliness and faintness in the Church, when the candle of the Lord burnt awfully dim, a few great spirits arose, and boldly proclaimed the truth as it is in Jesus. But, become by the necessity of the case the express apostles of "evangelical truth," they gradually began to lose sight of "apostolical order." The consequence was, that while endeavouring to obey one part of the apostolic precept, to "hold fast that which is good," they too much neglected the no less imperative injunction to "prove all things." Hence, omitting to seek the interpretation of divine truth at the fountain-head—namely, from the writings of the apostles, as interpreted by their immediate successors, they fell in with the erratic spirit of the time, prone, alike in interpreting the mysteries of the kingdoms of nature and grace, to prefer plausible theorizing to laborious investigation; and were content to adopt the lucubrations of Calvin and others, without enquiry made as to whether they agreed with the doctrines held by the Church in days when apostles and apostolically-taught men were her personal instructors. To such an extent did this error prevail, that for a long period, indeed until very lately, what was called *evangelical* preaching was almost invariably identified with the dissemination of the doctrines of Calvin—the chief exception being in the writings of those who in a similar erratic spirit fastened their faith upon the conceptions of Arminius. Thus do extremes meet. The very men of all others most opposed to Romanism were those who gave in to the source of its most perilous self-deceivings—the engrafting of novelties upon the pure catholic and primitive faith. The successors of these excellent, but in some respects misguided, men are distinctly enough

to be traced in the present day. Their tenets are to be found embodied in the leading articles of the small-fry of the serious periodical press—religious newspapers and such like; articles frequently deserving of admiration for the support which they would give to the cause of *evangelical truth*, did they not regularly pull down their own work by their more than half avowed contempt for *apostolical order*. Hence, instead of a systematic defence of the great essentials of Christianity—systematic, because organized upon Catholic principles—we find them, as might be expected, sometimes right, sometimes wrong, striking evermore in the dark, and consequently never striking with effect or advantage, but as liable to injure a friend as an enemy. We shall gain a yet further insight into the notions of these well-meaning but mistaken individuals, who fancy themselves Churchmen, if we attend for a moment to the Shibboleth of their party.

Their cry, in common with that of sectarians of every shape and name, is evermore for what they are pleased to term "the right of private judgment." The everlasting *refrain* of their song at public meetings and elsewhere is the oft-misquoted saying of Chillingworth—"The Bible *only* is the religion of Protestants." We shall just occupy a few words on these two favorite tenets of the day. Abstractedly, in this free and enlightened land, none but a Romanist denies the right for a moment. The Church of Rome—let us carefully contrast this with her present mawkish professions of liberality, and think of the wolf in the sheep's clothing—the Church of Rome clearly and distinctly *denies* the right of private judgment, and drags to the rack, the scaffold, and the stake (at least where she dares) all who presume to differ from her, unless she is changed, and then not infallible. Not so our pure and apostolic Anglican branch of the Church Catholic. She, indeed, as a tender mother, would guide her children into the way; but she imposes no temporal penalties upon them for going out of it. The heaviest penalty is imposed by themselves. And her conduct is precisely in harmony with the spirit of our other free and enlightened institutions. Thus, by way of example, no one abstractedly denies the right of a free-born Englishman, if he will, to do any thing, however absurd, so long as his conduct does not directly tend to a violation of decorum or a breach of the peace of society. The man is left to the free exercise of his right of private judgment or rather want of judgment. It is no interference with the liberty of such an one, if we tell him what he is doing, and warn him of the probable injury he is bringing on himself by his folly: but it is an interference with his liberty if we hand him over to the constable.

Another illustration may perhaps be more obviously appropriate:—The Church has buoyed certain channels in steering for the port of eternity; she tells all who neglect to keep the prescribed course that they run a heavy risk of being stranded amidst shoals and quicksands, or at least of hindering themselves much in their progress towards the wished-for country. She gives them this friendly warning; but, unlike the Church of Rome, she refuses to "sink, burn, and destroy," those who hesitate to comply with her directions. Now there are many who will be every man his own expounder, who are some (as they think) of Paul—some of Cephas—some of Apollos—some of Christ: who, confounding the *intellectual* illumination of the Spirit with the *moral*, pin their faith to the theories of some favourite expositor or (so called) evangelical preacher. They thus exercise their right of private judgment in turning their backs upon the beacon-light far shooting from the rock of apostolical antiquity, in order to follow the *ignes fatui* of modern conjectural interpretation. Thus they pursue their dreamy way amidst the uncertain and ever conflicting currents of opinion, like vessels without a rudder and without a compass, at the mercy of every wind that blows under heaven. Such is and must be the position of these clamourers for the right of private judgment. Deluded by the phantom of popery which scares them away from consulting the primitive fathers as WITNESSES,* they are content to grasp the shadow whilst losing

---

* "Against the ancient fathers and the early Church (says Mr. Faber, referring evidently to 'Ancient Christianity,' &c., by Isaac Taylor) a succession of charges, both negative and positive, has lately been brought by an ingenious author who does not give his name.

"In their teaching, it seems, they omitted the weightier matters of the Gospel, and occupied themselves, not very profitably, in gnosticising upon the virtues of celibacy, in lauding the potent meritoriousness of fasting, in prominently exhibiting the benefits attendant upon the invocation of dead saints, and in determinately mystifying the sacraments, until those divine ordinances assume the suspicious colour of the veritable Romish *opus operatum*.

"The professed object of these charges is to aim a blow at the well known Oxford 'Tracts for the Times.' I do not quite clearly understand the author's chronology: for, though his special attack is upon what he calls the *Nicene Church*, meaning, I suppose, the Church subsequent to the first Council of Nice; yet, in search of his materials, he seems inclined to travel back well nigh, if not altogether, to the apostolic times. Had he distinctly *limited* the term of his attack to the fourth and fifth centuries, a very fair argument, on Tertullian's just principle that *every doctrinal innovation is a palpable adulteration*, would have been brought against the Tract writers; but if he means to carry up his censures to the *strictly* Primitive Church which conversed with the apostles, I should think, on the principles of historical testimony, PROVIDED his case could be *evidentially* established, that the gentlemen of the Tract school will hold themselves obliged to him for consolidating a much stronger argument in their favour than I have as yet chanced to encounter.

"However this may be, I here mention the work, simply lest it should be

the substance, and to take their articles of faith from John Calvin, instead of from those who knew and conversed with John the Divine. The Church, however, visits such with no temporal penalty for these their erratic absurdities; she warns them of the danger into which their error is likely to lead them; she lays down for them a sure and safe principle of guidance,* by forsaking which they render themselves in many cases virtually excommunicate, but in the exercise of a mild and tolerant spirit peculiarly her own, she pursues them with no temporal ban. If they continue in their delusion, she leaves them in sorrow to their own devices. How absurd then is the froth continually put forth in magazines, from pulpits, and on platforms, about "liberty of conscience," and the free exercise of the "right of of private judgment," as if the Anglican Church either interfered with the one or questioned the other.

Immediately allied to this clamour, and another result of the

---

eagerly caught up, by some strenuous misopaterist, as stultifying the *legitimate* principle of an appeal to antiquity.

"Agreeably to the wise recommendation of the Anglican Church, we, who are her dutiful sons, appeal, in the way of *evidence* not to this father or to that father, but to the entire succession of the fathers from the very beginning: and, furthermore, we appeal to such aboriginal succession, not for the purpose of imposing upon the faithful matters unscriptural or extra-scriptural, but in order to ascertain, through their *harmonious testimony*, what was ALWAYS the catholic received sense of doctrinal Scripture; inasmuch as our very principle, in direct opposition to the spurious Tridentine principle, is a *strict limitation* of our appeal to the evidential ascertainment of the true apostolical sense of doctrinal Scripture *only*.

Now, whatever gratuitous absurdities may have been personally advocated by the fathers as we descend the stream of chronology, and whatever unscriptural notions may have been by them heaped upon sound catholic doctrines, this cannot affect their unanimous TESTIMONY to the *universal reception of really Scriptural doctrines from the very beginning.*

"Let *all* the fathers, if the author means to include them *all*, gnosticise ever so copiously on fasting and celibacy; or let them, with the Roman Clement unexpectedly at their head, labour ever so perseveringly to obscure and overlay the sincere Gospel by mystifying the sacraments, and by invocating the saints: must we say, that *therefore* they become, henceforth and for ever, quite useless and incompetent WITNESSES, as to whether the Catholic Church, from the time of its foundation, universally held, or universally denied, the doctrines of the Trinity, and Christ's Godhead and the atonement, and many others, which, correctly or incorrectly in the abstract, are yet all professedly deduced from *Scripture*?

"Truly, we might just as reasonably maintain, that those grave clerks who, in the days of good King James, devoutly believed in witchcraft, were *therefore* incompetent WITNESSES to the real quality of the doctrinal system professedly deduced from *Scripture* by the Reformed Church of England.

* "Let them, in the first place, take care that they never teach any thing in sermons which they would have the people hold and believe but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and which the catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected from that very doctrine."—*Vide Canons of* 1571.

habit of too hastily snatching at things without proper investigation, is the use, on the part of this class, of the everlasting adage —"The Bible only is the religion of Protestants." This wise, and true, and pious saying, is perpetually brought forward, as Mr. Faber observes in his preface—

"In order to shew Chillingworth's decided approbation of that modern hermeneutic system, which, throwing aside all *ancient ecclesiastical testimony in the true sense of doctrinal Scripture*, would set up, in its place, the mere *unsupported opinion* or the mere *insulated private judgment of each jarring and conceited individual.*

"No such vague empiricism, however, as the system in question, seems ever to have crossed the well-exercised brain of Chillingworth. So far from it, he distinctly gives in his adhesion to that identical Anglican principle of an *appeal to concurrent antiquity*, for which, until better informed, I shall always feel it my duty to contend.

"*Let me tell you* (says he) *the difference between the various Protestant Reformers is the difference, not between* GOOD *and* BAD, *but between* GOOD *and* BETTER. *And they did* BEST *that followed* SCRIPTURE INTERPRETED BY CATHOLIC WRITTEN TRADITION: *which rule the Reformers of the Church of England proposed themselves to follow.* *

"And again: *The doctors of the Romish Church do the principal and proper work of the Socinians for them, undermining the doctrine of the Trinity, by denying it to be supported by those* PILLARS OF THE FAITH *which alone are fit and able to support it: I mean,* SCRIPTURE *and* THE CONSENT OF THE ANCIENT DOCTORS. †

"In thus delivering his own principle of Scriptural interpretation, which, as he truly states, is the principle of the Church of England, Chillingworth seems not to have anticipated the remarkable modern discovery, that an appeal to *Scripture* INTERPRETED *by Catholic written tradition*, (I employ his own precise words) is no other than the introduction of *a second rule of faith which entirely supersedes and nullifies what ought to be the* SOLE *rule:* and as little, apparently, did he anticipate that, in the rapid spread of theological light and scriptural knowledge wherewithal in the present day of great things we are blessed, he himself, because he had declared that *the Bible* ONLY *is the religion of Protestants*, should again and again, upon platform and in magazine, applauding and applauded, be adduced as the uncompromising advocate and the indubitable patron of that same discovery."

But now to turn to a view of the opposite party. It was naturally enough to be expected that the grievous disregard of Catholic authority, in matters no less of doctrine than of order, on the part of those who were deeply imbued with more of the sincere love than the right understanding of evangelical truth, should have led many learned and thinking individuals

* Chillingworth's Relig. of Protest. chap. v. § 82. p. 285. Tenth edit. London, 1742.

† Chillingworth's Relig. of Protest. Preface, § 16. p. 16. See my Apostolicity of Trinitarianism, book ii. chap. 1. § 1. 8.

to turn their attention more particularly to the much forgotten discipline; and that from keeping their eyes thus steadfastly fixed upon this one object, their views with regard to doctrine should have been much coloured and modified (as indeed to a certain extent, it was right that they should be) by their views, sometimes carried to extremes, with regard to discipline. Hence the origin of a narrow and exclusive theology embodied in the "Tracts for the Times" and other productions emanating chiefly from the cloisters of Oxford, which tended to maintain too much, as those of the other party had maintained too little; and moreover, we fear, in many cases, to lead the junior and more enthusiastic adherents to give an undue prominence to externals, and to exalt mere matters of opinion or convenience into objects of faith. And whereas the study of the fathers had been too much overlooked by the others, and a due regard to their HISTORICAL TESTIMONY withheld; on the part of these again, the value and authority of the primitive divines was too much magnified, and their legitimate position, as witnesses to what was taught in the earlier ages of the Church, was changed into something more akin to that of judges, whose decrees were placed almost on a level with those of the apostles themselves. It is by no means difficult to perceive that this tendency to magnify historical testimony into authoritative decision must pave the way for the introduction of error whenever it derives a colour of support from the writings of the often mysticising fathers, and accordingly such has been the result. There is too much of the mint and the anise and the cummin of the gospel in the writings and sermons of the school to which we refer, and this we feel bound to state, whilst doing all justice and paying all affectionate regard to the eminent spiritual-mindedness which distinguishes many of its leaders.

And not only is an undue prominence frequently accorded to the less weighty matters of the law, but the systems of divinity propounded by the Tract writers abound, as might be expected, with much actual error, amongst the most prominent of which stands that, *as they hold it*, of Baptismal Regeneration. Mr. Faber, by his masterly clearing up of this matter, has conferred an invaluable service on the Church. Invaluable, we say, because, following the admirable principle *medio tutissimus* to the letter, interpreting Scripture first by Scripture itself, and afterwards by the light of Catholic antiquity (which must, *as he employs it*, be a true light, if the apostles understood what they themselves wrote), he has succeeded in producing a work which, independently of the immense mass of collateral information which it contains, is more than all valuable, as presenting a

rallying-point, where the better educated and the more sound udging of both sides may find a comfortable ground of union, as we sincerely trust, for the good of the Church, that they will. The question which we hope he has set at rest for ever forms, with that of apostolic succession, the great battle-ground between, what in default of a more accurate nomenclature, we suppose we must call, the High and the Low Church party. The one holding much to apostolical order, but somewhat dark in their views of evangelical truth; the other having clearer, though by no means correct, views of the latter, but who, proceeding upon the principle of the Presbyterians at the Reformation—that every thing done contrary to the practice of the Church of Rome must be right—cast out of sight, in their zeal for what they deemed *evangelical truth*, all wholesome regard to *apostolical order*.

In the views advocated by Mr. Faber, the thinking, well-informed men of both parties may meet, as we have already observed, and as we hope to succeed in showing, upon a fine vantage-ground, from whence to attack the common enemy. The implicit follower of the Tracts will have his opinions greatly cleared, and enlarged, and modified; the same result, we were about to say, will follow, as regards the Evangelical Low Churchman. But we must retract our prognostication—we fear we are saying too much. It is not so easy to lay aside that lax habit of theologizing which pins its faith on the mere unsupported dicta of favourite expositors, and is content to substitute assumption for proof, and one-sided assertion for impartial investigation. This much, however, at least is certain, that all who are not determinedly bigoted to certain sets of opinions—all who are not committed to the watch-word of a party—all who have sufficient clearness of discrimination to see the perfect compatibility of giving heed to the weightier matters, the great doctrines of faith, whilst by no means overlooking the mint and the cummin of the gospel—the full possibility of preaching a doctrine gloriously evangelical, whilst holding a discipline nobly apostolic—such will here find rest to their souls—such will become what Mr. Faber is—what our great Reformers were—what we glory in being ourselves—what all who are not led away by too lax a spirit on the one side, or restricted to too narrow a mode of theologizing on the other, are rapidly becoming —need we say that we mean EVANGELICAL HIGH CHURCHMEN?*

* We find that we have been misunderstood by some in our use of this term, as though we were seeking to call into existence any new sect in the Church. We need not say that we never for a moment entertained any such intention. There are a vast number of Churchmen who, having regard mainly in their

But it is high time that we present our readers with a rapid sketch of the contents of this truly noble work; and in doing so we shall make no scruple of employing our author's own language as we may find occasion. Indeed, so clear and so terse is this deeply learned and gifted writer, that it would be a task of no small difficulty at times to put his statements with any thing like their proper effect into a clearer form.

As there has been no more fruitful ground of controversy than that arising from the employment of terms, the meaning of which neither opponent understood in the same sense as his antagonist, we will begin with our author in clearly defining what we mean by the use of the term "Regeneration." Let it be clearly understood, then, that the word is employed throughout these pages in its fullest and most unlimited sense. That whatever is signified by the terms—new birth; birth from above; birth of the Spirit; conversion of the heart; renovation; new creation; putting off the old man and putting on the new man; illumination; passing from moral darkness into moral light; resurrection from the death of sin to the life of righteousness; formation of Christ within a person; being begotten again to become the sons of God; circumcision of the heart in the Spirit; or whatever other expression may most clearly and most fully designate the passage of a man from a state of sin into a state of grace—that we mean here by the term "Regeneration." And be it understood, that this is no ill-advised or hastily assumed definition of our own. Mr. Faber clearly shows that in the early Church these were synonymous terms; so that we are most in accordance with the views of Catholic antiquity on the subject, when we thus express ourselves concerning regeneration. Thus much being premised, we will glance for a moment at the three systems which modern theologians have propounded as alike claiming to exhibit the true sense of Scripture upon this subject.

The first of these is that of Augustine, who is erroneously imagined by many to have held the doctrine of baptismal

writings and ministrations to the great doctrines of the gospel—the fall, the atonement, justification, and sanctification—are most decidedly to be termed "*evangelical*" in their views, in contradistinction to the mere propounders of moral essays and the drivellers in externals. But, holding, at the same time, the apostolical succession, and the necessity of Episcopal ordination as the alone channel for the ministerial commission, they are doubtless entitled to the appellation of "High Churchmen," to distinguish them from those who entertain on this topic semi-presbyterian notions. We know not how we could better speak of such so as to exhibit in one view their combined love of truth and antiquity, than under the designation of EVANGELICAL HIGH CHURCHMEN—a class now forming, we rejoice to say, by far the greater, as they always did the more important, portion of the clergy.

regeneration in the same sense as now do the Oxford divines. It sets forth regeneration as being simply a federal change of relative condition, and under that aspect determines it to be *inseparably* connected with baptism. But it insists not upon any such necessary and inseparable connection with baptism, in regard to that *moral change of disposition* which it would, in contradistinction, denominate *conversion* or *renovation.*

The second system defines regeneration to be complex, viz., a *moral change of disposition* associated with a federal change of relative condition; and under that aspect broadly determines it to be *inseparably* connected with baptism. But while it thus insists upon an *inseparable* connection, it exempts from such inseparability the case of an impenitent, or profane, or infidel reception of the sacrament on the part of an adult.

The third system defines regeneration similarly, deeming it a moral change of disposition identical with conversion or renovation, but pronounces that regeneration is not so inseparably tied *to* baptism, but that it may be conferred also either *before* or *after* baptism.

It will follow, then, that the question to be settled between the second system and the third, and thence ultimately between the second system and the first, is this:—whether the necessary moral change of disposition, by whatever precise appellation we may most fitly designate it, takes place, with a single excepted case, invariably at baptism; or whether it takes place sometimes before baptism, sometimes in baptism, sometimes after baptism. As nothing dangerous or unscriptural can possibly be construed out of the first system, according to the definition given by its framers of the term regeneration, we shall at once proceed to the question between the second and the third, where the real tug of war lies in the present state of the controversy.

Now the case of infidel adult recipients being an admitted exception on the part of the adherents of the second system, it is only necessary, so far as adult baptism is concerned, that, following the footsteps of Mr. Faber in settling the question between the third system and the second, we appeal first and primarily to Scripture itself, and secondly and subordinately to the testimony of ecclesiastical antiquity.

The second system clearly asserts the inseparability of moral regeneration from baptism. The third as distinctly maintains the reverse. That we may decide which is the true view of the question, let us first take up a passage of St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians. Mr. Faber has quoted the same passage with a somewhat different object—the exhibiting, namely, of the manner in which the Church had copied the example of St. Paul in

propounding to the lapsed the necessity of (a sometimes verbally disguised) regeneration. It will, however, be none the less applicable to our purpose. The passage is as follows, "My little children, of whom I *again* travail in birth until Christ shall have been formed in you, I desire to be present with you now and to change my voice; for I stand *in doubt* of you."* The apostle, our author upon this argues, had already *once* travailed in birth of the Galatians when, by a faithful preaching of repentance and conversion through Christ crucified, he was preparing them for a due and beneficial reception of baptism. "Ye know," says he, "how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the Gospel unto you *at the first.*"† But in the case of some, at least, he feared that his original labour had been ineffectual. I stand (said he) in *doubt* of you.

What then, under such circumstances, remained to be done? St. Paul informs us that, by yet a *second* attempt to bring them to a practical reception of the sincere Gospel, he is *again* travailing in birth of them until Christ shall have been formed in them. His *first* attempt had been unsuccessful; for in some of them he greatly doubted whether Christ *had* been formed. He determines, therefore, to make a second attempt; and this, through God's blessing, he trusts may be more successful. "I *again* travail in birth of you, *until* Christ shall have been formed in you." The word *until* expresses his fear that no such internal formation of Christ had *as yet* taken place; and the word *again* expresses his determination to renew his labour, in order that what hitherto had *not been* effected, might at length take place. Meanwhile he solemnly declares:—"That in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a *new creation.*"‡ And this new creation he presses upon them, inasmuch as, without *it*, every thing else would be vain and unprofitable.

Thus theologizes St. Paul to the Galatians: and how are we to understand his language? The spiritual formation of Christ in a person, as the Church always interpreted the phrase, is a synonyme of regeneration, or renovation, or conversion, or (as the apostle speaks) new creation. Hence, when the sacrament of baptism had been, as the Church might charitably hope, worthily and therefore effectually received, the newly initiated and regenerated mystæ (as baptized catechumens were wont to be called) were thenceforward denominated Christophori, or Christ-

---

* Gal. iv. 19, 20. † Gal. iv. 13.

‡ Gal. vi. 15.

bearers, inasmuch as they bore Christ formed within them. This we learn from Cyril, of Jerusalem, in the fourth century.* But the phraseology itself was in that age by no means modern; on the contrary, it runs back even to apostolic times. Thus Ignatius, the disciple of St. John, constantly in his Epistles styles himself Theophorus, or God-bearer; and when questioned by Trajan what such an extraordinary title imported, he promptly replied, agreeably to the Catholic faith, which teaches the essential divinity of our Saviour, that "a Theophorus is one who has Christ in his breast internally." Such being the case, since the idea of a *second* regeneration has never for a moment been tolerated, St. Paul, in *again* travailing that Christ might be formed in the Galatians, insinuated his doubt and fear, that, although baptized, some of them had never been morally regenerated. We think it difficult to exhibit a clearer or more unanswerable proof from Scripture of the separability of moral regeneration from baptism; at least, so far as the case of adults goes.

Turning now, in our legitimate use of tradition from Scripture, argued by itself, to its great truths, supported and elucidated by the historical testimony of those who lived nearest to the days of the apostles, we proceed to quote at length a proof taken from Clement of the actual opinion of the Church on the same side of the question:—

"Flourishing in the latter half of the second century, this father attests that, in his days, there were sundry persons still alive, who

---

* "Upon the title, *Christophorus*, the Romish mythologists have strangely built the monstrous figment of a gigantic St. Christopher, who on his shoulders bore the infant Christ over a river which could not be forded by mortals of ordinary stature. 'I am not,' says Mr. Faber, 'sufficient antiquary to fix the age of this fable: but it does not occur in either of the *Gospels of Christ's infancy*.' A print of the holy giant thus bearing the Saviour, while the water only reaches up to his knees, I remember once to have encountered. Christopher afterwards suffered martyrdom, declining, I suppose, to put forth his gigantic strength in self-defence. Thus having obtained a place in the Romish martyrology, he was duly supplicated to make his votaries worthy of the honour of the Deity, to confer upon them consolation, to take away the bitterness of death, and to give them a good delivery in the day of judgment.

Martyr Christophore, pro Salvatoris honore,
Fac nos mente fore dignos Deitatis honore,
Promisso Christi, quia quod petis obstinuisti,
Da populo tristi dona quæ moriendo petisti.
Confer solamen, et mortis tolle gravamen.
Judicis examen fac mite sit omnibus. Amen.

Such is Popery, or, as its adherents would fain persuade us to call it, Catholicism! *These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.*"

had immediately conversed with the holy apostles, Peter, and James, and John, and Paul, and who had faithfully preserved and communicated to the theologians of his time and succession the true tradition of the blessed doctrine of the gospel.

"From some one of these, who probably had it from St. John, he received, of course when he was himself a young man, a very remarkable story; no concocted fable or mere ecclesiastical romance, as he expressly states, but a literally true narrative, which had been handed down to him, and which he had carefully treasured up in his memory. The story was this:—

"St. John, in the discharge of his metropolitan duties, which extended specially over the Lesser Asia, had occasion to go to a city not far from Ephesus. Here he became acquainted with a youth, whose outward bearing and seemingly good disposition greatly interested him. His stay, however, could not be prolonged. Whereupon, at his departure, turning to the individual whom he had appointed bishop of that city, he solemnly, in the attesting presence of Christ and his Church, committed to his spiritual charge the young man whom he had deemed so promising a subject. The bishop accepted the charge, and after conducting him through the regular course of catechetical instruction, finally believing him to be sincere and devout, admitted him to the sacrament of baptism. After this, on the ground that the supposed neophyte was sufficiently defended by the baptismal seal of the Lord, the episcopal superintendence was slackened. But the judgment proved erroneous. The youth, left to the devices of his own evil heart, followed the natural, though hitherto unsuspected, bent of his inclination; and thence speedily joined himself to a troop of idle, and dissolute, and thoroughly profligate individuals, his equals in point of age. For a season, they indulged only in expensive and riotous living, but at length they organized themselves into a regular gang of marauding banditti. The charitably supposed regenerate and indisputably *baptised* convert exceeded them all in violence, bloodshed, and ferocity; whence, by acclamation, he was chosen to be their captain. Thus, from bad to worse, matters went on for a season. In course of time business again brought St. John to the same city, and on his arrival, one of his first enquiries respected the promising youth, in whom he had felt so deep an interest. 'Bishop,' said he, 'pay me back the loan which, with the Church for our witness, Christ and I intrusted to you.' The bishop, not understanding him, thought that through calumny he was thus called upon to refund a sum of money which he had never borrowed; but the apostle soon undeceived him. 'I re-demand at your hand,' said he, 'the soul of the youth whom I intrusted to your pastoral care.' On this, groaning and weeping, 'Alas!' replied the bishop, 'he is dead.' St. John promptly enquired how, and when, and by what death? 'To God he is dead,' rejoined the bishop, 'for he has fallen away to all evil courses, until at length, becoming a robber, he has, instead of taking Christ's Church for his portion, occupied, with his abandoned associates, a mountainous wild, fit for their lawless purposes.' Forthwith, at these

lamentable tidings, after rebuking the bishop for his negligence, the holy and aged apostle rent his garments and beat his head; then having demanded and procured a horse and a guide, he took without hesitation the direct road to the formidable haunt of the robbers. Reaching their outposts, 'Lead me,' cried he, 'to your captain, for I am come specially to see him.' The commander of the banditti, little at first suspecting the character of his visitor, received him armed as he was; but as soon as he perceived the well-remembered countenance of the venerable man, he precipitately betook himself to flight. 'My son,' cried his eager pursuer, regardless of his own age and infirmities, 'why fleest thou from thy old and unarmed father? Fear not; there is still in Christ a hope of thy salvation.' At these oft-repeated exclamations, the robber-chief first stopped with his eyes fixed to the ground, then throwing down his arms he burst into a flood of tears, wherewithal he was baptised as with a second baptism. Upon this, so the narrative concludes, the apostle led him back to the Church, and offering up abundance of prayers, and wrestling with him in prolonged fastings, and soothing him with words of hope and consolation, he desisted not until he had restored him to the Church; thus effecting a mighty example of true change of mind, and a signal indication of REGENERATION, even a trophy of such a resurrection from the spiritually dead as all men might openly behold.

"On the exquisite beauty of this story, which Eusebius has happily transcribed from a now lost work of Clement, it is superfluous to descant.

"It is here adduced, simply in evidence: and it goes to prove, that, in the judgment of the earliest Church, sanctioned apparently by the voice of an apostle, and at all events in full harmony with that apostle's own written record, an unworthy recipient of baptism might hereafter, if truly penitent, obtain, either through the means of God's Revealed Word forcibly brought home to his soul, or through the means of a devout and believing reception of Christ the Saviour, that moral regeneration which, in his previous outward baptism, he had, by reason of his unworthiness or spiritual inaptitude, failed to obtain.

"The conversion of the young man, so Clement received and recorded the statement, was a signal indication of REGENERATION; even a trophy of such a resurrection from the spiritually dead (the precise description of man in his natural or unregenerate state) as all might behold and admire.

"Here we have no ambiguity. The moral change of mind, the metanœa, the transmentation, produced by the successful application of God's Word and the powerful exhibition of Christ the Saviour, is explicitly declared to be, not a mere restoration to the beneficial enjoyment of an already communicated privilege, but actually, and absolutely, and unreservedly, the grace of REGENERATION itself: and the declaration, moreover, runs with such a complete appearance of unpremeditated familiarity, that we cannot equitably doubt its propounding the universally received and accredited doctrine of the Primitive Church, as

a matter too notorious to require either apology, or softening, or explanation.

"The youth, after he had been so remarkably induced to quit the life of a robber and an outlaw, is unreservedly declared, through St. John's prayers and effectual predication of God's Word, to have been REGENERATED.

"Consistently with this declaration, as he is said, by the bishop who baptized him, to have been, nevertheless, spiritually dead to God and the Church; so, upon his subsequent REGENERATION, he is said to have afforded a trophy of such a resurrection from a state of spiritual death as all men might clearly and palpably behold.

"But yet further, we are assured that, upon making a fair outward profession, he had, anterior to his entering upon a course of sensual profligacy and lawless violence, been regularly admitted to the sacrament of baptism.

"Now, from all these several recorded facts, we can, I think, legitimately draw but one inference.

"The youth had received baptism dissemblingly, secularly, impenitently, unworthily: or else perhaps he had received it under the influence of merely excited animal feelings, like those of the hearers compared in the parable to stony places, with no deepness of earth. Therefore, along with the outward sign, he had not received the inward grace of moral regeneration. Hence, he remained dead: though for a season, to fallible man who cannot read the heart, he might seem to be alive. But, nevertheless, he became a signal trophy of God's wonderful mercy. After an interval of several years spent in rapine and bloodshed and debauchery, he was brought, through the mean of God's Word most powerfully preached to him by an apostle, to a lively and penitent sense of his true condition: and thus, in the judgment of the Primitive Church, as guided apparently by the judgment of St. John, he exhibited, in his own person, a mighty indication of REGENERATION, successive to an unworthy and therefore morally ineffectual reception of outward baptism. In all its points, so far as I can perceive, the proof is complete."

It appears from hence that when Clement spoke of a post-baptismal regeneration, he did nothing more than maintain the doctrine of a yet prior age—of that, in truth, in which flourished the immediate disciples of the Lord.

Baptism then being shown by the clear testimony of Scripture and of the Primitive Church, not to be always the means of moral regeneration, a highly probable presumption is introduced, that it is very far from being the sole medium through which the grace of regeneration is conveyed. A refusal to admit this will involve us in consequences too startling to be entertained for a moment. The doctrine of a second regeneration never having been admitted, we should have to look upon sin after baptism as the sin against the Holy Ghost, and to consign those who would be penitent to all the horrors of des-

pair, the dread and withering certainty of final condemnation at the judgment. We should thus close up to the contrite sinner the avenue to the mercy-seat—place him, in fact, on a level with the lost angels. And since all have sinned and come short of the glory of God—seeing that there is none that doeth good and sinneth not, what becomes, upon such principles, of the whole of the human race? Yet, to such monstrous conclusions have some been driven, in consequence of their viewing baptism as the *sole* medium of regeneration.

We shall now proceed to show what other media are recognizable. An unanswerable proof having already been given that regeneration is not *always* the concomitant of baptism, and a strong presumption having been thereupon presented, that there exist other media by which this spiritual grace is conferred, the testimony of Scripture and of the fathers upon this point next demands our attention. Our author, in prosecuting the enquiry, has commenced by arranging the texts which bear upon it with beautiful regularity of classification, in order that they might stand "nakedly and simply exhibited." First comes the memorable declaration of our Lord to Nicodemus—"Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God."*

2. "Such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."†

3. "Ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power. In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses."‡

4. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ, were baptised into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.||

5. "After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly

---

* John iii. 5, (the first eight verses are quoted by Mr. Faber).
† 1 Cor. vi. 11. ‡ Col. ii. 10-13. || Rom. vi. 3, 4.

through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."*

These constitute the texts of the first class; of those of the second class we have only space to quote two—

"As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, *even to them that believe in his name*, who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man; but of God."†

"In Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but the new creation."‡

The following texts are some of those of the third class:—

"Though ye have ten thousand instructers in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel."§

"Being *born again*, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, *through the Word of God*."‖

"Of his own will begat he us *by the Word of Truth*, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures."¶

Upon these three separate classes of texts, Mr. Faber proceeds to argue as follows:—

"The texts of the first class very evidently so associate moral regeneration with outward baptism, as to exhibit that ordinance under the aspect of a divinely appointed channel or medium, through which, by the Spirit, moral regeneration is communicated. Man's regeneration, renovation, or spiritual circumcision, for all these terms are indifferently employed, is effected, they collectively teach us, by the direct *agency* of the Holy Ghost. But then water, they likewise collectively teach us, is the medium *through* which, in the devout administration, and in the faithful reception of baptism, the Holy Ghost operates."

Hence, from the texts of the first class we distinctly ascertain that baptism is at least *one* channel or medium through which moral regeneration is communicated. Whether it be the *sole* medium or channel of such communication, is another question, the settlement of which is referred to a consideration of the other two classes of texts which remain to be examined.

Now it is impossible to read the texts of the second class without perceiving that they set forth yet *another* channel or medium through which, no less than through baptism, the grace of moral regeneration is communicated; and consequently, that baptism is not the *sole* medium of such communication. In the

---

* Tit. iii. 4-7. † John i. 12.

‡ Galat. vi. 15; the other passages are 2 Cor. v. 17; Ephes. ii. 10-13; Coloss. iii. 9-11. § 1 Cor. iv. 15. ‖ 1 Peter i. 23.

¶ James i. 18. The remaining passages cited are Philem. 10, and 1 Peter i. 3.

first text of the present class, a birth, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God, is specifically mentioned; that is to say, for the words are apparently incapable of any other sense, the birth here spoken of is moral regeneration. But this birth from the exclusive will of God, as avowedly contradistinguished from the will of the flesh and the will of man, or, in other words, this moral new birth, or this moral regeneration, is introduced to our attention without the slightest reference or allusion to outward baptism as the necessary mean of its communication. Does then the text supply what might hastily be deemed a deficiency, by intimating any *other* medium through which the divine and sovereign Agent may be pleased to communicate it? Let us read and see—"As many as received Christ, to them gave he power to become the sons of God; even to them that believed on his name." Here then *another* medium, besides that of outward baptism, is clearly pointed out, through which moral regeneration may be conveyed to fallen man, even the devout or believing reception of Christ as contradistinguished from one merely speculative or intellectual. Hence, from the present class of texts we seem to gather that a believing reception of Christ, by whatsoever means produced, is yet a *second* medium through which moral regeneration is communicated.

Again, as regards the texts of the third class: they propound, without the slightest allusion to outward baptism, yet a *third* channel or medium through which the Holy Spirit conveys the grace of moral regeneration. This third mean is the living Word of God read and preached, constituting what is called the Gospel. Now this Word of God (not the Personal Word, Jesus Christ, but the revealed Word, as our best commentators rightly understand the term), is laid down as the channel, through the subordinate potency of which men are said to be spiritually begotten or born again. Hence we additionally learn, that the revealed Word, whether faithfully preached or diligently studied, is a third medium or channel through which the Holy Spirit communicates the grace of moral regeneration. If Scripture, then, itself propound THREE several subordinate instruments of moral regeneration, namely, outward baptism—a believer's reception of Christ, however produced—and the revealed Word of God read and preached—it seems inevitably to follow, that moral regeneration cannot be so inseparably attached to outward baptism alone, as to be the invariable concomitant of that particular mean exclusively. Thus Scripture affords us no uncertain light upon the great question between separability and inseparability.

Mr. Faber next proceeds, in a most masterly manner, to carry out the argument for this separability of moral regeneration from baptism by arguing from St. Peter's commentary on the deliverance of Noah, and from the judgment of St. Paul in the matter of circumcision, and likewise from the case of the thief upon the cross. Upon this our limits will not permit us to enter.

We turn, therefore, with our author, to the testimony of the primitive Church, as the natural and legitimate course in discussing a subject so momentous. "No sober person of either class," as Mr. Faber observes, with admirable justness of discrimination, "would presumptuously think of settling so weighty a question by the uninformed exercise of his own insulated private judgment. We are, therefore, for its due settlement obviously led, after examining Scripture itself in the first instance, to hear, in the second instance, lest we should err in our interpretation, the attestation of early ecclesiastical writers to the *sense* of Scripture as received in the primitive Church Catholic. For where a difference of opinion, as to the true purport of Holy Writ, subsists between men equally devout and equally desirous of promoting the glory of God in the salvation of sinners, mere insulated *disputation* will evidently be interminable, unless some distinct *testimony* can be produced, which shall establish the one system as scriptural verity, and which shall therein overthrow the other system, as built only upon misconception: it is plain that, in the abstract, *one* man's bare opinion is quite as authoritative as another man's opinion."*

---

* A note by Mr. Faber, which refers to Mr. Gladstone's work, "The State in its Relations with the Church," so accurately defines the true position of the sounder portion of the Anglican clergy, as hereditary witnesses for the truth, that we feel constrained to give part of it verbatim:—

"So far as our predecessors, the clergy in communion with the Roman Church, faithfully maintained that genuine body of Scriptural truth which descended from the very beginning, and which is unanimously attested in still extant documents by primitive antiquity, just so far, in relation to them, we may be deemed hereditary witnesses; and, just so far, we may be said to have conveyed it, through an unbroken series, from the apostolic age.

"But, to that huge doctrinal mass, which collectively the Roman Church defines to be truth, we assuredly are NOT hereditary witnesses, nor indeed witnesses under any aspect: neither do we, through an unbroken series, convey it and teach it as the truth of Scripture.

"Were we in this last position, we should still be Romanists. Ceasing to be Romanists, we have quitted this last position.

"In a word, while we claim to be partial heirs of the Clergy through the unbroken series of the middle ages, we have no ambition to be counted their universal heirs. We are hereditary witnesses to the truth, as unanimously attested from the beginning: but we are NOT hereditary witnesses to all which the Church of Rome pronounces to be truth, and receives as truth, and imposes as truth. Our aim is to be primitive, not Tridentine doctrinists.

That moral regeneration was very frequently the concomitant of baptism is so clearly and frequently maintained in the writings of the fathers, that we shall not concern ourselves with entering upon the proof of it. So entirely is our author aware of this, that he expressly informs us he has only adduced quotations on the subject for the purpose of giving completeness to his work as regards its plan. Our business will be more especially to show that the fathers clearly bear out the scriptural view which exhibits two other modes or channels by which the grace of regeneration is effected—namely, by a believing reception of Christ, and by the Word of God read and preached.

In proving the separability of moral regeneration from the mere act of baptism, we quoted the case of the young man who, falling after baptism into crimes of no ordinary magnitude and heinousness, was sought out and reclaimed through the instrumentality of St. John. But this narrative of Clement presents us (as has been seen) with a proof that this father evidently wrote under the impression that an unworthy recipient of baptism might hereafter obtain, either through the means of God's revealed Word, forcibly brought home to his soul, or through a believing reception of Christ, that spiritual regeneration which in baptism he had failed to receive. We find the same doctrine faithfully handed down to later ages; and under the cognate names of illumination, and conversion, and initiative perfection, and penitential baptism (for all these terms are of the same import, alike denoting a moral change of disposition), the possibility and necessity of a post-baptismal regeneration, when through unworthiness regeneration had *not* been received in baptism, is harmoniously insisted on by those four great fathers of the Eastern and Western Churches—Athanasius, and Ambrose, and Jerome, and Augustine. Our author shows, by quotations given at length, that Athanasius speaks of three baptisms* (meaning three modes or channels of regeneration), that Ambrose, in closely parallel language, speaks of a water of penitence and tears as a "food of conversion" ("cibum conversionis");† that Jerome speaks of a redemption by the blood of the Saviour, either in the house of baptism, or in penitence which imitates the grace of baptism;‡ and that Augustine likewise clearly asserts that "many men, even within the pale of the Church, are baptized while yet they are carnal and natural:" and at the same time that "we ought not to despair of the conversion of any

* Athan. Quæst ad Antioch. quæst. lxxii. oper. vol. ii. p. 296.
† Ambrose, Enarr. in Psalm xxxvii. § 10, 11, oper. vol. 1. col. 819, 820.
‡ Hieron. adv. Pelagian. lib. i. c. 10. oper, vol. ii. p. 232.

one, whether within or without the pale of the Church, so long as the patience of God leads him to penitence."*

The Church appears to have thus, with sufficient clearness, decided, that so far was baptism from acting mechanically, or *ex opere operato*, according to the Tridentine doctors, in producing moral regeneration, that, on the contrary, there were cases in which the spiritual grace did not accompany the outward act; and yet that unworthy recipients might afterwards, by some other means, be regenerated. The general principle thus laid down, she was, however, exceedingly cautious in applying directly and avowedly to particular cases. But, if moral regeneration may be communicated after baptism, when by unworthy reception it has failed in being communicated therein, it is argued, that, *à fortiori*, we are warranted in concluding, upon Scriptural principles, that it may be likewise communicated even *before* baptism and *without* it. St. Paul's was a case in point, though we have known it singularly enough quoted by the advocates of inseparability in support of their view of the question. We think it scarce possible to read the simple narrative of his conversion, without perceiving that, through a believing reception of Christ, as the awful conviction flamed upon his astonished vision, that spiritual change, which we call regeneration, and which the old fathers identify at times with the term conversion, had passed upon him previously to his actual baptism: the sprinkling of the water becoming then a visible sign or seal of his spiritual renovation. But another example, which admits of no doubt, and which may therefore be adduced as conclusive testimony on the subject, is that of the penitent, though unbaptized, thief, which presents us with a specimen of regeneration taking place, not merely before, but moreover without, baptism; and, in like manner, as regarded martyred catechumens in the days of Pagan persecution, will any presume to say, that many of these, having fought the good fight, and borne their testimony even to the death, died unregenerate because unbaptized, and were therefore inadmissible into the kingdom of heaven? Not so determined the primitive Church. By an exquisitely beautiful theological fiction, she held the baptism of such martyrs in their own blood: and, as she triumphantly pronounced upon their everlasting security in heaven, she in the same voice, as a necessary consequence, asserted their regeneration!

Nor was the case of unbaptized martyrs by any means the

* August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 14, 15, 17. Oper. vol. vii. p. 50, 51. "There can be no mistake as to the import of the term conversion here employed by Augustine."

sole case, in which it was held, that salvation, and therefore, necessarily, regeneration, might be accorded to the unbaptized.

A catechumen, in all things walking in conformity with the gospel of Christ, might suddenly, without baptism, be summoned away by death. Far, very far, was the Church from deciding that in such a case the hopeful candidate was consigned to the regions of despair. Greatly more in accordance with what, we think, is the spirit and tenor of the gospel was her determination, when here again she tenderly and rationally decided, that of such a man likewise, the salvation was undoubted, and thence of necessity the preparatory regeneration. In sure and certain hope, then, did she commit the soul of her believing catechumen to the loving guardianship of the everlasting arms: and the body, though unwashed at the Church's fountains, was considered as spiritually washed by the Church's Head, and as safely reposing in comfortable union with him, till he should call, and it should answer him again from the dust: and stand forth in the loveliness and the grandeur of a triumphant resurrection. And with the same tenderness of Christian charity, speaks the Church of England, when, in the office for the baptism of such as are of riper years she inculcates the necessity of the sacrament *where it may be had.*

In proof of the opinion of the early Church upon this important position—the security of many who die, not having received baptism, and the existence (which must be consequent indeed upon that fact alone) of other means and channels of spiritual regeneration, Mr. Faber adduces the clear and unmistakeable testimony of a number of fathers, beginning with Clement of Rome, and ending with Augustine, amongst which we can only cite the declaration of Irenèus—"That it is the knowledge of God which reneweth a man." This author says much of the vivifying Spirit in the work of regeneration, but he is silent respecting baptism. It is not that he denies this last to be a means, but he evidently views it as not the only mean; since his subject led him to treat of a different one, even the knowledge of a God through a faith which "cometh by hearing."

But, up to this point, we have been occupied almost entirely with considerations connected with the baptism of adults: and so far our course has been sufficiently clear, following, as we have done, in the wake of our admirable author. But we are next led to what he acknowledges to be the most difficult part of the enquiry, the question, namely, of infant baptism. Here, however, he again triumphantly maintains his position. The point of difficulty he shows to consist in proving the separability of

moral regeneration from baptism, in the case of infant recipients. In favour of this view of the subject, perhaps the most striking argument that can be set forth generally in the outset is from acknowledged facts, borne out and supported by the statements of Scripture. Those facts are, first, the sad and painful one, that many, who have been baptized in infancy, live all their lives and go down to the grave without any tokens of a moral regeneration: the other is, that many having lived long in sin, exhibiting all the sad workings of the natural man, and bringing forth the bitter fruits of impenitence, do at length—by the wonderful goodness of God speaking to their conscience, whether by a sermon, a sudden judgment, the still small voice of the Spirit, or whatsoever visitation—believingly embrace Christ as their Saviour, and experience a change both of habits and conversation, which can be described by an imagery no less vivid than that of an entirely new creation, of a spiritual resurrection from the darkness of a sepulchre. But the opponents of this view are provided with a ready means of escaping all difficulty. They, as is well known, maintaining the constant infusion of the spiritual grace in the administration of its outward sign, most readily admit at the same time the possibility of the life thus infused decaying at times and withering altogether, at other times of lying long dormant before germinating into the promise of a future glorious harvest. So that what we term the regeneration—the entire creating anew, which takes place in the morally awakened, they would have us term rather a restoration, or recovery from moral sickness. Now this view of the subject holds good of those who having once evinced signs of grace had fallen away, like David, and been again restored. But we refer to cases radically and entirely different. St. John has laid down certain tests of moral regeneration, and those, without aught that savour of distinctive reference to the two cases of adult and infant baptism. His method of recognizing an individual upon whom the great moral change has passed which marks him for a son, is as follows:—"By a doing of righteousness;"* "by purifying himself, even as God is pure;"† "by not habitually and allowedly committing sin;"‡ "by loving the brethren *as* the brethren;"§ "by a living belief that Jesus is the Christ;"‖ "by a victory over the world through which it is effectually overcome;"¶ and by a diligent keeping of himself so that that wicked one toucheth him not."** Where these tokens exist, the man is regenerate; where these do not exist, he is not.

* 1 John ii. 29. † 1 John iii. 1, 3. ‡ 1 John iii. 9.
§ 1 John iii. 10-14. iv. 7. ‖ 1 John v. 1. ¶ 1 John v. 4. ** 1 John v. 18.

Those, therefore, who contend for a regeneration in baptism, unevidenced by any outward fruits, are in fact maintaining the singularly untenable position, that men *not* engaged in doing righteousness, *not* purifying themselves even as God is pure, who *are* habitually and allowedly committing sin, hating or despising the brethren, giving no evidence of a living faith in Christ, seeking to obtain no victory over the world—but who, on the contrary, are in love with the world, and so far from diligently keeping themselves, are evermore giving place to the devil—who when weighed in every balance of the sanctuary are found lamentably and awfully wanting, are nevertheless the bearers of a true and hidden manna—the vessels of an inward and spiritual grace: a grace so "inward" and so "spiritual" as not only to be altogether itself imperceptible, but to admit the exhibition of nothing save the qualities most opposed to its existence. And, if we be told, in reply, of the compunctious visitings and occasional anxieties as to their eternal condition, which all, except those beneath the brutes in ignorance, must have at times felt; and if these be appealed to as evidences of the strugglings within of the spiritual life implanted in baptism: then, with our author, we must crave to deny altogether the force of such appeal; we must refer the emotions so spoken of to the workings of God's Spirit upon what we sometimes hear called natural conscience, which, let an apostle be witness, works among the Gentiles no less than in those who outwardly bear the Christian name.

In the case of adults, we have clearly established it as an admitted theory, that unworthy recipiency invalidates the grace of baptism. But our opponents will endeavour to escape from the force of this admission as it regards infants, by asserting that they can by no possibility present any obstacle to a worthy reception. This is on their part a matter of pure assumption. The seeds of sin being sown from the beginning, the being conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity, bringing to the font no fabled purity, alas, of innocence, but the young germination of a carnal mind, which is emphatically stated to be enmity against God: how shall we presume to say that, even where consciousness has not been awakened, there is not at work the growing seed of rebelliousness; so that even the smiling and white-robed infant, which seems to our loving eyes a very incarnation of the cherubim, comes there as a young hater of God—as a being prepared rather to oppose than to do his will. Let us look to it whether, in taking an opposite view of the subject—in denying the possibility of opposition on the part of infant recipients, we are not directing our gaze in the direction of the rankest errors

of Pelagianism—the capability of man, "who is of his own nature inclined to evil," to turn and prepare himself to love and obey God.

Is it said that we are forsaking our own principles in arguing thus—that we are taking a one-sided view of Scripture, and deciding merely upon our own private interpretation, which is and must be mere matter of opinion? Then let us hear the Church.

We can show beyond question that the primitive Church clearly held the possibility of children, under some circumstances, being regenerated without baptism. The slaughtered innocents who were murdered in the days of Herod were always accounted martyrs and precursors of Christ, and, as such, admitted into the kingdom of heaven. Upon the touching loveliness of this conception we cannot afford to linger. We must employ it simply as appealing to an assured fact—that, as these infants could not have been baptized, and yet were looked upon by the Church as the precursors of Christ, here, at least, was one ruled case of the possibility of some having been regenerated before and without baptism—of the consequent possible separability of moral renovation from the outward sprinkling, and likewise of the existence of other means of regeneration. The interesting fact, from whence these conclusions are drawn, is stated on the authority of Irenæus,* who in his youth had been a hearer of Polycarp, the friend and disciple of St. John. The writings of Cyprian† exhibit also the same standing idea. Passing over the testimony of Tertullian, we go on to notice a work entitled "Questions and Answers to the Orthodox"—ascribed to Justin Martyr, though probably not earlier than the middle of the third century. The fact stated there is, that the beneficial or non-beneficial effect of baptism, in the case of infants, depended upon the faith or want of faith of the sponsors. Whether this principle be sound or unsound in the abstract, matters not to our argument; the fact so asserted stands forth as another proof that the primitive Church held the possibility of infants not being morally regenerated in baptism—in a word, the separability of the outward and visible sign from the inward and spiritual grace. If the sponsors lacked faith, the child remained, though baptized, unregenerate. Although evidence is not abundant upon the point, partly because it was not until controversy begat definition that much was methodically laid down on the subject, yet in turning to the later testimony of Augustine, we are, in fact, ap-

* Iren. adv. hær. lib. iii. c. 18, p. 204.

† Cyprian. Epist. lviii. oper. vol. ii. p. 123.

pealing to that of the early Church (already clearly shown to be favourable to the doctrine of separability), since Augustine appeals to his statements as to the received Catholic doctrine. Now Augustine, we all know, held the doctrine of a federal regeneration as inseparably taking place in baptism, which few, we presume, would attempt to deny; and hence he has been taken by the advocates of what is commonly called baptismal regeneration—that is to say, by the Inseparabilists—as a supporter of their view of the subject. So far from it—but let him speak for himself. We cannot enter into a view of his fine argument as to the moral correspondence of circumcision under the law with baptism under the gospel: we must content ourselves with briefly stating his lucid exposition on the tests propounded by St. John:—

"You claim," says he, "to have received the sacrament of baptism. True: but this does not demonstrate your moral regeneration. St. John has given you a test of your regeneracy or your unregeneracy. Examine, therefore, and see whether, in your inward principles and your outward conversation, you exhibit the signs and tokens of moral regeneration which have been specified by the apostle. In baptism, which you received when an infant, you have indeed been federally regenerated; but, with regard to moral regeneration, or what I call conversion of heart, the whole matter may be stated in a single sentence. They who have charity have been born of God: and they who have it not, have not been born of God."

It is impossible, we think, to wish for any thing more clear and decisive upon the subject; Augustine becoming, in fact, by his express appeal to his statements as being those of the Church Primitive and Catholic, "a host of witnesses in himself." Having thus, as we trust, clearly exhibited our author's proof of the separability of regeneration from baptism in the case of infants as well as adults, we need not enter upon the other modes or channels of the conveyance of the spiritual grace. The doctrine of separability being once admitted, the exhibition already made of the channels of regeneration is no less applicable to the case of infants than to that of adults. And this appears, indeed, to be the rock upon which all the divines of the "Oxford Tract" school and their followers split—the overlooking the fact, asserted in Scripture and attested by the Church, that there are other modes of regeneration besides baptism. In their doctrine of inseparability we see the fruitful source of all their errors—of the cloudy anomalies in which they are evermore involved—of their constant mistaking of the bearings of the great question between sense and faith—of the two great mis-

chiefs of their style of teaching and preaching, the tendency to magnify the sacraments instead of the Saviour, and to merge the particular experience of the individual in that of membership generally of the Church. But let us not be considered as saying too much. It is well to think solemnly and highly of our spiritual food in the sacraments—well to fall back upon the sublime and "quieting reflection," that we are members of a noble Church, pure in her doctrines and apostolic in her descent; that our spiritual ancestors are a long array of confessors, and martyrs, and holy men now with God, and that, if living a life of faith below, we are speedily hastening to mingle with their song and join their company. And, whilst we forbear to judge harshly of them that are without, to defy those whom God hath not defied, and venture not to decide how far he may bless their ministrations, delivered always in actual contempt—frequently in insulting defiance of apostolical order; still must we congratulate ourselves as having been, by the bounteous mercy of our God, preserved within the pale of the original fold. But whilst looking with a charitable eye on those not so safely placed, we must, all along, crave leave to question any man's authority to assume the ministerial office without apostolical sanction. Yet, though Christ be preached even of contention and strife, and we are far from saying that this is the case with those who differ from us, still with St. Paul herein do we rejoice, yea, and will rejoice. In fine, we would in all things show charity—in all moderation—in all love of evangelic truth—in all regard for apostolic order; and on these principles it is that we would earnestly invite those who are most inclined to pay regard to this last, to see that they are giving all diligence to that which ought evermore to go hand in hand with it.

It only remains that we show the conformity of the doctrines of the Anglican Church on the subject of regeneration in baptism, with those of her ancestress, the Church Primitive and Catholic.

Whoever has paid attention to the statement of the latter, as exhibited in her formularies, can scarce have failed of perceiving what was the principle upon which they were constructed. Her declarations, particularly on the subject of baptism, were general in their form, admission being thus left for distinction in the case of specific instances. Mr. Faber adduces a remarkable passage from Clement of Alexandria, which we wish we had space to insert at length, but in connection with other important statements, it asserts that "it was impossible to determine the exact time" at which the grace of illumination or regeneration was

conveyed to the soul. From this passage our author thus exhibits the principle on which the Church's offices were constructed:

"It was found impossible, as Clement speaks, to determine the exact time when Christian knowledge and divine illumination were, like a blaze of lightning, imparted to the previously dark and ignorant soul of the unregenerate. Hence, on the ground of this impossibility of precise determination, the time of baptism was generically assumed to be the time of regeneration; and hence, every baptised person, when to the legitimate ecclesiastical interrogation such person had given what was charitably deemed the answer of a good conscience toward God, was publicly pronounced and acknowledged to have been born again.

"Such then, according to Clement, was the true *rationalè* or principle of that generalizing official declaration, which the Church was accustomed to make from the very beginning. The mean of outward baptism was cognizable by the Church and her functionaries; but the two other scripturally specified means of a believing reception of Christ and of the revealed Word of God, upon which last mean was based the whole system of catechetical instruction, were, very obviously and of plain necessity, not similarly cognizable."

This intimation will serve as a remarkable key to the language of the ancient theology, and also to that of our Church as constructed upon the primitive model.

She has a statement to make with regard to those admitted within her pale by baptism. She cannot read the heart; but what then? When the question has been put and the (presumed) answer of faith has been given, either by the individual recipient or by his sureties, she then generically asserts the individual's regeneration. So each child is taught to speak of his baptism, as that in which he was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.

Again in the office of confirmation, and throughout her public and in her baptismal articles, the public acknowledgment is everywhere made in the generic judgment of charitable confidence;* so that with perfect consistency and soundness, after an individual infant or adult has been baptized, she thanks God that it hath pleased him to regenerate this person or infant with his Holy Spirit, to receive him for his own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into his holy Church.

But, since there will always be danger, as Mr. Faber observes,

* Some of our readers, who may feel inclined to oppose this view of the matter, will be surprised to learn how nearly Mr. Simeon accords with it in his sermon on Gal. iii. 27-29. We quote his authority as one of no small weight with the evangelical Low-Churchmen, of whom Simeon was *not* one.

that declarations made *generically*, should be interpreted *specifically;* the Church of England, borrowing the principles and following the steps of the early Church, "in the systematic official adoption of generic as contradistinguished from specific phraseology, duly guarded by careful explanation and strict limitation against any abuse of her language on the part of individuals, and thence, for the purpose of preventing error, resorted to explanation and limitation."* Hence, holding, as she does in the case of adult baptism, that grace only attends a worthy reception, she distinctly maintains that moral regeneration is by no means limited to outward baptism.

Again, she speaks, in the XXVIIth Article, of faith and grace in worthy adults as existing previous to baptism, and as capable of increase through baptism. And lest she should be considered in the case of any or all to limit regeneration to the sacrament, as its sole channel, she informs us that it is "*A* means whereby we received the inward and spiritual grace, and *a* pledge to assure us thereof." "Why not (asks Mr. Faber) *the* mean and *the* pledge?" Why, but because she would leave room in her *specific* teaching

---

* Note by Mr. Faber: "The principle of genericism pervades all the offices of the Church of England: and, in her seventeenth article, it is, even by name, inculcated.

"Promissiones divinas sic amplecti oportet, ut nobis in Sacris Literis *generaliter*, propositæ sunt.

"The reader will observe, that, in the Latin article, the word employed is *generaliter*, not *plerumque*.

"Many, I believe, who have not consulted the unambiguous Latin article, understand the ambiguous word "generally," of the English article, in the sense of *plerumque*, or for the most part. But this is not its import. It denotes *generically*, as opposed to *specifically*. The Church, as a body corporate, can speak officially in no other manner. See my "Primitive Doctrine of Elect." book ii. chap. 9. § I. 1. (2.) She cannot perpetually vary her public language to suit the case of each individual; nor, in truth, would it become her, who is no infallible searcher of the heart, to pronounce at baptism an unwarrantable and presumptuous sentence of reprobation and condemnation against any person.

"So inherent is this phraseological necessity, that we find the language of genericism constantly employed by the inspired apostles themselves. When St. Paul, for instance, writes to the Romans, he generically addresses himself to ALL that be in Rome, as beloved of God, called saints. He does not specifically except, as unworthy of the name, Appius, or Valens, or Crispus. Yet, I suppose, in the strict sense of the term, we are not thence to conclude, that *every* Roman Christian by profession was a saint beloved of God, demonstrated to be such both by his principle and by his practice.

"Nay, even a greater than Paul, even Paul's divine Master himself, uses the language of genericism, when he addresses his twelve apostles collectively or collegiately; though, at the very time, he unerringly knew that one of them was a devil and would betray him. *Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves.* Yet Judas, specifically, answered not to any such description."

for the insisting upon other ways and channels by which may be conveyed the inward grace of regeneration.

In fine, follow the Anglican Church all through her Liturgy, throughout her Homilies,* and throughout her Articles, and we shall find that generically and officially she recognizes all her members as regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church.

"But her plan," as our author observes, "is entirely and remarkably changed, when in a sermon she solemnly appeals to the conscience of the individuals themselves. She then calls upon each baptized person specifically to prove and examine his own self, by those tests of regeneration which have been divinely laid down by St. John, and which have been incidentally pointed out by St. Paul under the aspect of the fruits of the Spirit and the works of the flesh. Officially she will not judge him; but she exhorts him, not lightly and after the manner of a dissembler with God, to judge himself. The glass of the gospel she holds up before his eyes; and, after having fully described what moral regeneration really is, she plainly tells him, that by his inward disposition and his outward practice he must determine whether he has or has not received the Holy Ghost; in other words, whether he has or has not been spiritually and morally regenerated. To these she refers him as affording the only sure evidence of his new creation; and she concludes with assuring him, that he does but deceive himself, if, without such evidence of his regeneration, he ventures to think well of his religious condition."

Hitherto we have spoken of *moral* regeneration, and shown that *it* is to be understood in the largest and fullest sense. But we must not forget that though *this* can only be predicated of the newly baptized by the Church's judgment of charity, there *is*, nevertheless, a sense in which she most clearly and unconditionally declares that they are regenerate.

As yet we have only mentioned the scheme of St. Augustine, without entering upon the important question to which it leads us. We must now however, though briefly, do so, in order to exonerate our Church from the charge of expressly declaring as a fact that which she only supposes to be so in the judgment of charity. It is very true, that to assert generically is one thing, and to assert specifically is another; and we are prepared to show that our Church does the first with regard to *moral* regeneration, and the second with regard to federal regeneration. That Christ is formed in the heart of the baptized person, she asserts with reference to the class into which he has entered; trusting that, in answer to her prayers, it may be so with the individual.

* Vide Sermon for Whitsunday, 1 Homil. b. II, pp. 389, 391.

That the baptized person has commenced a new relation both with regard to God and the Church, having become a son, however disobedient, of the one—a member, however unworthy, of the other; that, in other words, he is *federally* regenerate—she asserts, not generically, but specifically—not in the judgment of charity, but as an undoubted and incontrovertible fact.

Now if this federal change of condition were all that the Church contemplated in the passages so often discussed, there would be an end of the difficulty; but she has done more than this, for she has spoken of spiritual benefits *inseparably* connected with baptism. We have already seen that these spiritual benefits do not consist in moral regeneration; for the Church acknowledges cases in which this blessing is not conferred at baptism, and points out certain other channels for its conveyance. She commands us to "acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins." This passage in the Nicene Creed is founded upon two assertions of the evangelists: Mark i. 4, and Acts ii. 38. This latter is as follows: "Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." The primitive Church, in accordance with this Scripture, taught the remission of sins at baptism: to those who faithfully received that sacrament *complete* remission and *moral* regeneration; but to *all*, remission and federal regeneration. That this doctrine was much misunderstood and grossly abused, we freely acknowledge. Nay, to such an extent was the misunderstanding and abuse carried, that many refused baptism till they were on their death-beds, trusting thereby to obtain, without any sacrifice, the kingdom of heaven. Constantine the Great was one who did thus. Still, as we are not entitled to argue against any doctrine from the abuse of it, the errors of Constantine and others do not help us over the apparent difficulty by giving us a right to reject the tenet altogether. There is one view which may be taken which at once justifies the Church, reconciles her with Scripture, and acquits her, on the one hand, of making *moral* regeneration inseparable from baptism, and, on the other, of denying *any* inseparable spiritual benefit in that sacrament.* This view is, that the *guilt* of origi-

* A very important proof that the Church never declares what she has not the *full right* and the *full intention* to declare, may be seen in her use of absolution considered as we considered it in our last number, in the article entitled "Defenders of the Faith." Those who entertain any doubt on the orthodoxy of those views will do well to consult "Bingham's Christian Antiquities," book xix. chap. 1, sec. vi; Wheatley on the Common Prayer (on the absolution

nal sin is *invariably* remitted, though alas, the moral corruption of human nature remains. Now, as this original sin is the only guilt which can attach to an infant; and as the baptismal water, by a modus operandi of which we can know nothing, is the means of its remission, the whole *guilt* of the child is removed, and a spiritual as well as a federal blessing *invariably* conferred. But, on the other hand, as an adult has not only the guilt of Adam, but that of his own personal sins, to answer for: it is evident that neither the federal regeneration nor the remission of original sin can be sufficient for his salvation. She requires also a *moral* regeneration. Hence, the infant dying without baptism, is left to the *uncovenanted* mercies of God—mercies, which we know to be infinite, and which we humbly trust will be exercised towards it. At the same time, how great is the guilt of those who neglect to secure for their children God's *covenanted* blessings.

We might follow Mr. Faber throughout the whole of his interesting and masterly assertion (we will not call it defence) of the Church's principles: but we have said enough to exhibit, we think, with sufficient clearness, the ground he has assumed; and we can only earnestly press upon all who have ever thought the subject worthy a moment's consideration, immediately to procure his book, and to allow themselves no rest till they have made themselves masters of its contents. The result may be one, by God's blessing, of incalculable benefit to the Church. One more brief quotation from him in conclusion, which we beg to inscribe to all cavillers at the Church's services without her pale, and to all within her pale, who may think them corrupted and unscriptural, and wish them altered:—

"So perfect is the resemblance of the Anglican doctrine to the primitive doctrine in every particular, that no one who knows how to value the attesting judgment of the early Apostolic Church, would wish, that, even in a single iota, the baptismal offices and other allied documents of the Church of England, should ever be made to feel the officious hand—officious and not valiant—of *ignorant*, and therefore *unskilful* alteration."

---

to the sick); Bishop Fell, in Cyprian de Lapsis; Dr. Hammond (note on John xx. 23); Archbishop Potter, on same passage (in his treatise on Church Government, chap. v. p. 345); Marshall on Penitential Discipline, p. 219-220; Tertullian de Poenitentiâ, ch. 10.

ART. II.—*Preferment; or, My Uncle the Earl.* By Mrs. GORE, Authoress of "Mrs. Armytage," "Stokeshill Place," &c. 3 vols. London: Colburn. 1840.

2. *The Prelate:* a Novel. 2 vols. London: Boone. 1840.

IT is not, for obvious reasons, our practice to make any lengthened remarks upon the ephemeral productions usually denominated "novels." "A novel," observes Pollok, "is a book three volumed and once read," and though it cannot be denied that many works of fiction exhibit ability of far too high an order to be forgotten after a single perusal, yet an attention, however slight, to the thousand volumes sent forth season after season by Messrs. Colburn, Bentley, and others, will convince us that the poet's description is at all events not far wrong. It would be a strange revelation should Mr. Hume, in some patriotic moment, move (and succeed in carrying his motion) for a return of all novels published within the last ten years, with the alleged grounds of their claim to popular favour.

What a recapitulation would there be of paragraphs from newspapers without number, announcing the terror of dukes and earls, of duchesses and countesses, at the "forthcoming disclosures in high life"—how many promises of "a most *piquant* and personal narrative"—how many scarcely veiled sketches of "distinguished living characters"—how many "revelations involving the reputation of more than one noble house!" and when the whole mass was before the reader, with what disgust would he perceive that a large portion *was almost liable* to a prosecution from the "Society for the Suppression of Vice; and that nine-tenths of the remainder was a farrago of the most contemptible trash possible.

We have no intention of discussing the expediency of novel reading, or the laudability of novel writing—neither is it our purpose to enter into the literary merits of any novels, not even those at the head of the present article. We shall take a glance at them as what they pretend to be—pictures of the world, and notice their reflected working upon society. To do this at length would, however, lead us further than either *we* should wish to go, or our readers to follow us: we shall, therefore, limit our observations to one point, viz., the Church, as depicted in the fashionable novel. It might be supposed that if the merit of this class of works be so small, their effects must be proportionately so; but when it is remembered that though only "once read," there is yet a perpetual succession emanating from the

press, each of which has also to be "once read," we shall perceive that the weakness of the impression is compensated by its frequent repetition, as the continual falling of single drops wears at last a hole even through a stone. To this it must be added, that there is no inconsiderable portion of society whose sole reading consists of novels and periodicals—who take, therefore, from this source their ideas of the world in general, and more especially of the classes above them. If there be one failing in modern society, and perhaps in a peculiar degree in that of England, which is more dangerous and more disgusting than another, it is the perpetual striving after effect—the anxiety to be what the more educated call "correct," and the less educated "genteel;" in a word—the absurd error of supposing that vulgarity is a quality of things, and not of persons.

The effects of this pernicious notion are manifold: few persons who entertain it are content with their social position; fewer still are at once bold enough and honest enough to avow what that position is. So earnest are they to amalgamate themselves with the class upon whose heels they tread, that they are perpetually living upon the outskirts of what *they* call society, but half received by the order to which they wish to belong, and more than half renounced by the class they in vain attempt to quit.

Now this "sore and angry pride," as Mrs. Trollope rightly denominates it, when speaking of the Americans, has been mainly produced in this country by the agency of the fashionable novel—the novel of the "silver fork school." Written for the most part by half accredited members, or by mere parasites of the "aristocracy of fashion" it aimed to inculcate, that the dinner of a duke was not only the best of all possible dinners next to that of a prince, but also that his grace's mode of eating it was necessarily the most graceful. "I saw you at the inn (says Moliere's inimitable *Sbrigani* to *M. de Pourceaugnac*) where you alighted to breakfast, and the becoming grace with which you ate your victuals created in my mind the most sincere friendship for you." But what *Sbrigani* says in a spirit of the most bitter irony, these gentry would advance as matters of grave truth.

It cannot be altogether without effect that the middle classes who have no access to the society of those above them, should be misled as to the tone of that society. It cannot be without a mischievous tendency that a nobleman should be represented as drawling forth a strange patois of bad English and worse French—regarding as beings of a different nature, all whose

social position stands lower than his own, or as a tailors' block endowed with powers of locomotion, profanity, and licentiousness. In the very nature of things such misrepresentations must be attended with evil consequences; nor are these consequences materially obviated by the occasional introduction of a clever but conceited scoundrel, who is a very incarnation of all foppery and superciliousness.

A certain cardinal was commanded by Louis XIV. to preach at Notre Dame, but as he had always kept his purple free from the defilement of vulgar contact, he determined to give his congregation no excuse for familiarity; he therefore addressed them not "*mes bien aimés frères*," but "*Canaille Chretienne!*" The same spirit, if we may believe our novelists, pervades all the higher portion of English society.

But there are some writers who treat on such subjects who are both well acquainted with what is usually termed good, that is, titled society, and well disposed to represent it truly; and hence of late years we begin to find a marked improvement in this very trivial species of authorship. Countesses take up the pen instead of their waiting-maids, and lords write novels instead of leaving that department to their footmen. That society gains by the exchange is a matter that admits of no question; for of all books novels have the most extensive circulation; but while the higher classes are more fairly represented, the middle ones are mistaken in their turn. Rank and title seem, by the common consent of all fiction writers, to be the acknowledged "*summum bonum;*" nor do we recollect a single novel published within the last twenty years—and truly their name is Legion—in which the hero or heroine do not at last arrive at the dignity of the peerage. Even the professed novel reader becomes at last disgusted with the "*crambe repetita*," and sighs for the good old days of castles and banditti, of ghosts and trap-doors, of daggers and bowls of poison.

But we must not digress into a literary question, nor can we afford time to speak on the more important effects produced, in a moral point of view, by these very trivial, yet very influential books—*works* it would be absurd to call them. We hasten to the more immediate object of our attention: viz., the Church, as depicted by the novelist. And here we must remark, that the representation will be very different when made by a Scott, a James, an Edgeworth; or by such writers as Mrs. Gore and Mrs. Trollope; or by the "*vile pecus*" of ordinary fashionable novelists. The first class paint what they see, and they do so because their genius impels them to study nature, and to give the result

of their studies to the world; the second class paint what they invent, and they do so because they have a party to serve; the third class copy the vilest productions of others, and they do so with a perpetual reference to themselves, and a desire to exalt in the reader's eye their own social position—they stalk into the field of literature on paper stilts made of old peerages; and like Brummell, who, when asked by a beggar for a farthing, replied, "Fellow, I know not the coin!" they cannot even write a name without at least the prefix of a Sir John or a Sir Richard. Of such writers we shall now say no more; their *works* published last year are already in the hands of the trunk-makers; a new succession have taken their place, soon destined to enjoy the same long repose; but alas!—

"Mox daturos
progeniem vitiosiorem."

Ecclesiastical affairs have lately been prominently brought forward as the subject of certain novels. "The Vicar of Wrexhill" earned an unenviable notoriety for its authoress, and, perhaps, the most successful of Mrs. Gore's publications has been "Preferment; or, my Uncle the Earl." Those who, having nothing better to do, have beguiled their leisure by perusing the productions of this lady as they appeared, can hardly fail to have been struck with their gradual deterioration, moral and literary. Her first novels were brilliant sketches of fashionable people; and if they inculcated no good moral, were at least guiltless of teaching a bad one. As she went on, however, in her career of authorship, her mind seems to have become harder, and her sentiments coarser, and her ideas of moral rectitude less elevated, and her satire more vulgar, and in addition to all this, we find a continual tendency towards—growing at last into a positive advocacy of the "enlightened and philosophical liberality of our day." Now if we detest the principles of the "*esprit fort*," when we find them disseminated by means of a political treatise, or a party newspaper, we are not likely to tolerate them when they are served up in the disguise of a novel, and still less when they are presented by a female hand. There is nothing so unladylike as "liberalism;" and greatly as we condemn the atrocious libel entitled "The Vicar of Wrexhill," we are disposed to look upon it with more leniency than on "Preferment; or, my Uncle the Earl."

And not only have we reason to complain when a book, be it of a light or serious character, is not what it pretends to be; but our reasons are greatly increased when the quality withdrawn is the sole merit to which the work could pretend; much more then

have we cause for disappointment when the quality substituted is a positive mischief.

Now, we entreat our readers not to consider this investigation as one utterly below our dignity and their attention. At a moderate computation there are three hundred thousand volumes of *new* novels circulated *every year* throughout the length and breadth of the land; and supposing that each copy is read by ten persons, which all who know aught of circulating libraries will acknowledge to be a very low estimate, there will be three millions of individuals whose taste and opinions are more or less influenced by novel writers.

The characteristic of a good novel, and be it understood we use the term comparatively—for we most cordially wish there were no such things—the characteristic of a good novel is, that it should be a correct picture of human motives and actions. This condition we find fulfilled in the productions of Cervantes, and Le Sage of Boccaccio, in those of Fielding and Smollett, and, in spite of his tediousness, of Richardson; and in later days in those of Scott, and James, and Miss Mitford, and Theodore Hook, and *sometimes* of Miss Edgeworth. We say *sometimes* Miss Edgeworth, because that lady has strong prejudices, and has, perhaps unintentionally, given us pictures, not of the world as it really is, but of the world as she imagines it. We draw our knowledge of the habits and manners and social institutions of the earlier part of last century from the essayists, from plays and novels, and we entertain no doubt as to the correctness of the information they involuntarily give us. But in these days there is no literature analogous to the essayists: the modern comedy is for the most part beneath criticism, and the fashionable novel is the only source from which our great great grandchildren can draw any information *how* we ate and drank, slept and dressed, sinned and suffered—and the information is not without its value: could we resuscitate Steele, and Addison, and Johnson, and Boyle, and Goldsmith, and get them to give us new "Spectators," and "Ramblers," and "Tatlers," and "Citizens of the World," the novel might be swept away from the field of literature with great advantage—as it is the loss would be sensibly felt, though perhaps the benefits might overbalance it, the social position of the clergy is one important subject upon which the essayists and novelists give us many hints. Who is there who has not contrasted the "Vicar of Wakefield," with his humble pretensions, and the more dignified, though perhaps not more learned, incumbent of his own parish; or to compare fiction with fiction, how different are the clergymen of our friends, Messrs. Gresley

and Evans, with those of Fielding and Smollett—yet both drew from the life, and neither with any intention to colour too strongly. Let us make the comparison—

THE CURATE OF 1760.

JOSEPH ANDREWS behaved himself so well at divine service that it recommended him to the notice of Mr. Abraham Adams, the curate, who took an opportunity one day, *as he was drinking a cup of ale in Sir Thomas's kitchen*, to ask the young man several questions concerning religion, with his answers to which he was wonderfully pleased. Mr. Abraham Adams was an excellent scholar—he was a perfect master of the Greek and Latin languages, to which he added a great share of knowledge in the oriental tongues, and could read and translate French, Italian, and Spanish. He had applied many years to the most severe study, and had treasured up a fund of learning rarely to be met with in an University.

His virtues and his other qualifications, as they rendered him equal to his office, so they made him an agreeable and valuable companion, and had so much endeared and well recommended him to a Bishop, that at the age of fifty he was provided with a handsome income of twenty-three pounds a-year, which, however, he could not make any great figure with, because he lived in a dear country and was a little encumbered with a wife and six children.

Adams had no nearer access to Sir Thomas or his lady than through the waiting gentlewoman: they both regarded the curate as a kind of domestic only.

Mrs. Slipslop, the waiting gentlewoman, being herself the daugh-

THE CURATE OF 1840.

THE appointment of the new curate was soon concluded. Mr. Latimer wrote to his old friend, the Principal of —— Coll. Oxford, to request that he would recommend to him a zealous and orthodox curate, and before a month had elapsed, Mr. Hammond was licensed to the curacy * *

In some respects Mr. Hammond rather puzzled his parishioners. As to appearance it was easy to see at once that he was a gentleman of middle size, hair rather dark, &c. &c.; but as to other points, their curiosity was not so easily to be satisfied. Of his fortune they could learn nothing. He took a very small lodging in the outskirts of the town, and lived in the plainest possible manner, without horse, gig, or servant: yet he gave his money freely to the poor, and subscribed to the different parochial charities with the greatest liberality. Indeed, except Mr. Walton himself, no one contributed more handsomely. In his preaching, Mr. Hammond spoke very plainly and authoritatively, but at the same time he gave his instruction that turn, that it never appeared as if he was assuming any undue personal authority, but simply that he was the mouthpiece of the church. Certain it is that he (Mr. Walton) took a great liking to the young curate, and they soon found that they perfectly understood each other. This friendship proved extremely useful to Mr. Hammond, and added greatly to his consideration and influence in the parish. Nor was

ter of a curate, preserved some respect for Adams. She professed great regard for his learning, and would frequently dispute with him on points of theology, but always insisted on a deference to be paid to her understanding, as she had been frequently at London, and knew more of the world than a country parson could pretend to do. She had in these disputes a particular advantage over Adams, for she was a mighty affecter of hard words, which she used in such a manner that the parson, who durst not offend her by calling her words in question, was frequently at some loss to guess her meaning."—*Joseph Andrews*, c. 3.

it less agreeable to the other party—by bringing him acquainted with an excellent and amiable young man, with whom he soon became linked in the closest bonds of friendship; for, unlike old persons in general, his warm heart was not incapable of contracting a new friendship; and Mr. Hammond, on his part, was not less delighted with the confidence and conversation of his open-hearted parishioner."—*Clement Walton*, c. 4.

This contrast will be more remarkable the more attentively it is examined; and were we to peruse it through the two books, we should find every part bearing the impress of verisimilitude. Parson Adams wears a rusty cassock and lives on terms of equality with the lowest (not the *humblest*) classes of society, and lest we should suppose that the extravagances, into which Smollett's genius for caricature led him, had falsified the *social position* of the curate, we find more than one clergyman besides associating on the same terms with the same classes. But in the "Tatler," No. 255, we find a still more remarkable proof of the low estimation in which *the office* of a clergyman was held in the earlier part of the last century:—

"I am chaplain to an honourable family, very regular at the hours of devotion, and I hope of an unblameable life; but for not offering to rise at the second course, I found my patron and his lady very sullen and out of humour, though at first I did not know the reason of it. At length, when I happened to help myself to a jelly, the lady of the house, otherwise a devout woman, told me that it did not become a man of my cloth to delight in such frivolous food; but as I still continued to sit out the last course, I was yesterday informed by the butler that his lordship had no further occasion for my services."

After making some remarks upon this letter, which show that if the case be fictitious the grievance was real, Steele, with much humour, asks—

"These stiff-necked patrons whether they would not take it ill of a chaplain that, in his grace after meat, should return thanks for the whole entertainment, with an exception to the dessert? What would a

Roman Catholic priest think, who is always helped first and placed next the ladies, should he see a clergyman giving his company the slip at the first appearance of tarts or sweetmeats? In this case I know not which to censure, the patron or the chaplain—the insolence of power or the abjectness of dependance: for my own part, I have often blushed to see a gentleman whom I knew to have more wit and learning than myself, and who was brought up with me at the University upon the same footing of a liberal education, treated in such an ignominious manner, and sunk beneath those of his own rank by reason of that character which ought to bring him honour."

It would be easy to multiply instances, both in the drama, the novels, and the essays of the period to which we allude, which would amply prove, first, that the *office* of a clergyman commanded no respect for itself, but that respect, where paid at all, was paid to the rank, the wealth, and the fashion of the individual; secondly, that incumbents and curates were, for the most part, taken from different orders in society, and "*promotion from the ranks*," as we may with reference to *that* time call it, was by no means a common occurrence. Paley, indeed, intimates as much when he speaks of the advantage accruing to our Church by her possessing a ministry taken from *all classes*, and consequently exercising over all a close, permanent, and powerful controul. It is reported also of him that he said—"If, in walking through a northern village, you meet a man more rude in his appearance, more greasy in his dress, and more uncouth in his manners, than the rest of the people about him, that man is the parson."

Now we wish to investigate the causes that have raised the clerical order in public opinion, and produced a change which is still going on, whereby the respect which was once only paid to the *individual* is being gradually transferred to the *office*. But before we do this, we will point out the way in which the clergy are represented by our lady novelists of the present day; and this will be most easily and most satisfactorily done by three pictures taken from Miss Edgeworth, Mrs. Gore, and Mrs. Trollope, and intended to represent a bishop, a dean, and a vicar. They are all caricatures of the grossest kind: the first, probably, dictated by prejudice—the second, we fear, by spite and personal pique, and intended by the fair satirist for some living character, in which case we can assure her that her darts are harmless, as no one on earth can detect even a caricature likeness in *Dean Nicewig* to any living dignitary—and the third, to a horror of what has been oddly enough nick-named "evangelical preaching." We have heard rumours of personal meaning in the "Vicar of Wrexhill;" but though abominably libellous, Mrs. Trollope's pages are less waspish than those of Mrs. Gore.

BISHOP CLAY.

[From Miss Edgeworth—"Patronage," vol. i. pp. 164-5.]

"Bishop Clay had taken a prodigious fancy to him (Buckhurst Falconer) *for* he observed that in carving a partridge, Buckhurst never touched the wing with a knife, but after nicking the joint, tore it off, so as to leave adhering to the bone that muscle obnoxious to all good eaters. The bishop pronounced him to be a capital carver.

"Fortune, at this time, threw into Buckhurst's hands, unasked, unlooked for, and in the oddest way imaginable, a gift of no small value in itself, and an earnest of her future favours. At some high festival Buckhurst was invited to dine with the bishop. Now Bishop Clay was a rubicund, full-blown, short-necked prelate, with the fear of apoplexy continually before him, except when dinner was on the table; and at this time a dinner was on the table rich with every dainty of the season that earth, air, and sea could provide. Grace being first said by the chaplain, the bishop sat down richly to enjoy; but it happened in the first onset that a morsel too large for his lordship's swallow stuck in his throat. The bishop grew crimson—purple—black in the face; the chaplain started up and untied his neckcloth, the guests crowded round, one offering water, another advising bread, another calling for a raw egg, another thumping his lordship on the back. Buckhurst Falconer, with more presence of mind than was shewn by any other person, saved his patron's life. He blew with force into the bishop's ear, and thus produced such a salutary convulsion in the throat as relieved his lordship from the danger of suffocation. The bishop recovering his vital functions, sat up restored to life and dinner; he ate again and drank to Mr. Buckhurst Falconer's health, with thanks for this good service to the Church, to which he prophesied the reverend young gentleman would in due time prove an honour, and that he might be in some measure the means of accomplishing his own prophecy, Bishop Clay did, before he slept, which was immediately after dinner, present Mr. Buckhurst Falconer with a living worth 400*l.* a year, a living which had not fallen into the bishop's gift above half a day, and which, as there were six worthy clergymen in waiting for it, would necessarily have been disposed of the next morning."

Now after this lively and "piquant" scene, in a book which *every* body reads, let us turn to the preface, which scarcely any body reads—a preface too to the *third* edition, when, for the *first* time, we find an acknowledgment wrung from the writer by critical severity:—

"A bishop was really saved from suffocation by a clergyman in his diocese (no matter where or when) in the manner represented in chapter x. *The bishop died long ago and he never was an epicure.*"

To this picture of a bishop we might select from the same work, as a pendent, the picture of a dean, but we prefer to do this from Mrs. Gore's literary labours. ("Preferment," vol. ii. pp. 212-19.)

"There was, nevertheless, an individual to whom the arrival of the handsome young nephew in black was sovereignly displeasing. The Very Rev. Dr. Nicewig, Dean of Darlington, and ex-tutor to Lord Egerton and his brothers, was in the habit of passing three months of the year at his rectory of Wyndham, within a mile from the park gates of Tiverton castle. When not keeping his residence at the deanery, and presiding over the whist parties of the Darlington cloisters, or officiating as a royal chaplain, and cringing at royal and archiepiscopal levées, he was usually to be found carving Lord Tiverton's venison, or seasoning with modest conservatism the green tea of the dowagers visiting at the castle, in order to keep an eye upon the movements of his patron, lest his future chance of a bishopric should be endangered by an incautious profession, on the part of the earl, of politics similar to his own.

"It would have been difficult to find a more urbane gentleman than the Dean of Darlington. From his youth upwards he had never been known to inflict a wound upon the self-love of a fellow-creature, *i. e.* a fellow-creature in easy circumstances, or having a decent hold on the respect of society. His deportment was mild, his mouth mealy, his glance obsequious, his principles accommodating; he seemed to move on invisible castors, while the well-oiled hinges of his soul opened and shut as if by magic springs. * * *

"The fat revenues of an episcopate were less his object than the dignities of the apron and wig: the venerable pomposity of the emblazoned family coach, the spiritual peerage, the my lording of obsequious chaplains, and the senatorial voice which might do its part in dethroning kings and displacing ministers of state. To secure his professional advancement had been the object of Nicewig's life from the moment of assuming the preceptorship of the grandsons of the Earl of Tiverton. He became curious in the texture of his cambric; he took lessons in reading of an eminent tragedian; he was exactly such a tutor as Lord Chesterfield might have chosen for his son. * *

"By his obsequious assiduities he won so far upon the dotage of the grandfather and grandmother, that when the family living of Wyndham was rejected by William Egerton's son, the old earl did not a moment hesitate to reward with it the important services of young Nicewig, who was just then escorting home Lord Egerton from a tour of all the opera houses in Europe.

"It was amazing with what celerity the new rector glided into the decorum becoming his honours. * * Not a vestige remained of the private tutor. There was far more of the bishop-to-be in the new rector, than of the knowing bear-leader of Chiaja and the Rue de Richelieu. In every thing the nicest discernment demonstrated his obsequiousness to the tastes of the castle. * * * But no sooner was the old countess succeeded on the throne by her frivolous daughter-in-law, than Handel was superseded by Rossini, and a change came over the spirit of his arrangements at Wyndham rectory. * * * The next year, consequently, he was an archdeacon, and three years afterwards—partly, however, in consequence of the dedication of a volume of popular divinity to the

bishop of his diocese, who happened to be brother to a cabinet minister —Nicewig wrote himself down "Decanus." The wig which, to do it justice, had hitherto scarcely exceeded a brocoli, now sprouted into a full grown cauliflower; the fat upper footman at Wyndham rectory became a solemn-looking butler; the double-bodied phaeton, a chariot; and the Very Rev. the Dean of Darlington a more faithful humble servant than ever of the rouge and pearl-powdered Countess of Tiverton—with his favourite pupil in the lower house, his favourite pupil's father in the upper, and the shiloh of his future hopes, Lord Egerton, in command of the parliamentary influence of his old uncle, the Duke of Pelham. Nicewig felt as certain of his lawn sleeves as if his name had been already specified by the first lord of the treasury in a *congé d'élire.*"

Now there is a minuteness as well as a spitefulness in all this which looks very much like personality. It is evidently done *con amore*, and the whole character and conduct of the dean correspond. Though filling a very subordinate part in the *narrative*, he occupies a large space in the *book;* and it is worthy of note that his history and fortunes are in direct opposition to the presumed moral of the tale. Miss Edgeworth, in "Patronage," and Mrs. Gore, in "Preferment," profess the same object; namely, to show that advancement through the favour of the great is both more precarious and less beneficial than advancement through skill, probity, and industry—a proposition which requires about as much proving as that "the whole is greater than its part." The mode, however, which these ladies take to establish their position is somewhat curious. Miss Edgeworth demonstrates that three high-minded, highly-gifted, and highly-educated young men, with powerful friends and influential connections, are more likely to succeed in the world than three young men of inferior influence, inferior principles, and inferior abilities—that, in fact, honesty is the best policy, and that a sensible man has the advantage of a fool.

Mrs. Gore gives us a man with neither talent, nor learning, nor principle, advanced to the highest ecclesiastical dignities solely by patronage; and another man possessed of all these qualifications who chooses rather to marry a beautiful and accomplished young lady, with two hundred thousand pounds, than to reside on a small living given him by his "Uncle the Earl." If "Preferment" be not written to caricature somebody (but no man can tell whom) under the absurd name of Dr. Nicewig, then its aim would seem to be to prove that Church preferment is invariably bestowed either from unworthy motives or on unworthy persons.

But we now proceed to our third picture and allow Mrs.

Trollope to introduce the Rev. William Jacob Cartwright, Vicar of Wrexhill.*

"The person, voice, and address of the gentleman were singularly well calculated to touch and soothe hearts suffering from affliction. (p. 37.) Mr. Cartwright, though somewhat above the middle height, was shorter than his son, and his person incomparably better built; his features were very regularly handsome, and the habitual expression of his countenance gentle and attractive; his eyes were large, dark, and very beautifully formed; and his hair and beard as black as those of a Spaniard, save here and there a silver line which about the temples began to mix itself with the sable."

Thus much for the vicar's person, now let us hear his dying daughter's description to himself of his character:—

"I have heard you say, a thousand times perhaps, that religion was the business of your life, and for that reason, sir, its very name hath become abhorrent to my soul. Oh, father! you have much to answer for. I would have given my own right hand to believe in a good, a merciful, a forgiving God! and I turned my young eyes to you. You told me that few could be saved; that it was not what I deemed innocence could save me; you told me, too, that I was in danger, but that you were safe; you told me that God had set his seal upon you, and then I watched you, oh! how earnestly I spied out all your ways! I found fraud, pride, impurity, and falsehood, mix with your deeds through every day you lived." (Vol. iii. p. 256-7.)

And these are the bishops, priests, and deacons of an apostolic Church! These are pictures of life as it is in the nineteenth century! Now, we ask the reader, is it possible to look on these monstrous fictions and acquit Miss Edgeworth, Mrs. Gore, and Mrs. Trollope, of "envy, hatred, and malice, and all uncharitableness?"

But in these amiable qualifications there are various degrees of excellence, and Mrs. Gore has clearly distanced her competitors, inasmuch as she evidently writes from spite; whereas Mrs. Trollope, we verily believe, perpetrated a still grosser libel and still broader caricature in the spirit of fanatical sincerity; much as she may feel astonished at the application of such a term to herself, we must frankly tell her that she drew the character of the "Vicar of Wrexhill" precisely in the same temper of mind in which Calvin watched the flames he had kindled to devour the unhappy Servetus.

We speak without prejudice, for with regard to Mrs. Trollope we have none—we do not join the cry raised against her by fastidious people. We consider her neither vulgar nor

* "The Vicar of Wrexhill," by Mrs. Trollope. London: Bentley. 1838.

coarse-minded : like most writers of novels, she has written a large portion of broad farce, some of which is already forgotten; but she has also written books which deserve to be read, which are English in spirit and English in prejudice; and, indeed, except the miserable specimen of fanaticism to which we have already alluded more than we could have wished, her very prejudices are on the right side.

And now we dismiss the "Vicar of Wrexhill," because the *social position* of the clergy is not mis-represented in it, the higher orders of them are not traduced as "obsequious," "cringing," "fawning," "mealy-mouthed sycophants," and therefore the objects of contempt to the same orders of the laity; neither is the country curate depicted as the object of the same contempt, for the very satisfactory reason of his being "a poor drudge."

And now having dismissed the novels, we take upon ourselves to notice the gradual and still advancing change of which we have before spoken; the change which transfers respect from the individual to the office, which makes the clergyman, *as such*, the object of consideration. And this investigation will lead us to consider what was the natural effect of the old system—a system under which we find the curate "drinking a cup of ale" in the baronet's kitchen and disputing points of theology with my lady's waiting-woman.

It was one of the secrets by which the Church of Rome attained to her overwhelming greatness—that *all* classes of society were alike under her immediate superintendance. Did she wish to rule the great and the wealthy? She had among her hierarchy their own friends and family connections; princes wore her purple and forwarded her designs. She had female dignities to bestow on queens and countesses, and inculcated unceasingly an unfailing "esprit de corps." Was it the class immediately below these that engaged the attention of "holy Church?" She had her almost countless army of inferior prelates—of abbots and canons, and not less influential—of abbesses and canonesses. She reached the middle classes by her monks and parochial clergy, and the poorest and most illiterate were rendered amenable to her rule by an innumerable troop of wandering friars—

"White, black, and grey, with all their trumpery;"

but who, nevertheless, were faithful servants of the Roman Church. Now this enormous mass of ecclesiastical persons was not homogeneous, like our Anglican clergy of the present day—educated in the same schools, imbued with the same tastes, indoctrinated with the same learning, and taught to claim the

same position in society. It was a mass of heterogeneous elements, differing in education, in views, in hopes, in social station, and only held together by one overpowering principle, that of unlimited, unquestioning obedience.

Under this state of things, the Church was mixed up and amalgamated with every class and condition in life—with all the business and all the amusement of mankind, none were so high that ecclesiastical authority could not control them; none so low that they could have no clerical friend, nay confidant. Auricular confession was but an additional clamp in the framework of the Roman power, which would have remained almost as firm without it.

This could only be compassed by calling from among "all sorts and conditions of men" the component parts of the ecclesiastical body; by educating them as much and *a little* more than their fellows, but keeping them in the same station, with the same wishes, the same companions, the same prospects. Hence there was no separation, save that of superior assumed sanctity, between the priest and his former humble companions; he attained, it is true, influence over them; but it was because, though a consecrated person, he still remained in them, and among them, and *of* them. The little leaven leavened the whole lump; their *friend* interested them for the Church, claimed for the Church their obedience, and taught them her doctrines; and every one had his clerical friend so to direct and influencehim. Thus, from the very highest to the very lowest, there was not one person acknowledging the authority of the Roman See who was not accessible by one of Rome's ministers.

Now to a certain extent this was the case among the English clergy up to nearly the middle of the last century. Paley assures us in so many words that it was so, and his direct testimony is confirmed by the indirect testimony of a vast number of essays, plays, poems, and novels. But few among the clergy were educated at the Universities—fewer still were scholars, for a college degree was a very different thing then to what it is now. Smollett represents Abraham Adams as a learned man, but it is evident that had he pleased he might have been as ignorant as Trulliber: he had no motive to study save a love of learning, for it procured him no other honour than that of disputing with a lady's maid.

In the present day, a man enters the ministry in the hope (often, we allow, miserably disappointed) that it will procure for him, if not affluence, at least respectability; that his family will have the necessaries of life, and he himself be entitled to appear

in the world as a gentleman; he expects, in short, a living more or less valuable, as he thinks more or less highly of his own talents or his own connections. Nor let it be said that this is unjustifiable. "He who serves the altar must live by the altar;" and if a poor man, when ordained, tells his bishop that he is totally indifferent to preferment, we should hold that bishop amply justified in taking him at his word.

But in the days to which we refer men entered the ministry with no expectation beyond the poor pittance to which they were entitled as curates. No University degree, little, if any, theological learning was needful; and the curate, in birth, rank and expectations, if a little above the labourers, was certainly considerably below the farmers of his flock. The working clergy of small towns occupied a position a little higher; those of cities a little higher still; but as their congregations were also proportionably higher, the relative condition of the minister and his people was the same.

Thus far then the situation of the Anglican Clergy and the constitution of the Anglican Church, bore a strong resemblance to those of Rome. The Bishop and the Dean influenced the nobleman; the Archdeacon and Chancellor were potent with the baronet; the Rector and the Vicar hunted, drank, and quarrelled with the 'squire; the chaplain associated with my lord's butler, and the curate with the same functionary in the squirely circle.

But this similarity, on which the great Paley congratulated the Church, had one working among Romanists, and another among Protestants: in the one case it produced zeal, in the other case apathy. A century ago reverence for the Church was in England a mere tradition, and like all *mere traditions* it was rapidly dying away. The clergyman lived with and like other people; he partook, too often alas! of the same vices, and almost always of the same prejudices; he had neither the assumed sanctity nor the arrogated authority of the Roman priest, and what was gained to the Church on the one hand by the amalgamation of the clergy and the laity, was lost on the other hand by the absence of any claim of authority on the part of the Church herself. In addition to these drawbacks, there was no unity of purpose, no "*esprit de corps*" among the Anglican priesthood; each regarded himself, not as a member of a great body appointed to do a great work, but as the isolated minister of a single parish, seeking perhaps to do good, but seeking this desirable object by no more effectual means than his own individual influence and popularity.

The Church of Rome, on the other hand, however ill educated in other respects her ministers might be, taught them, at all events, the comparative worthlessness of individual and the preponderating energy of combined exertion—proved to them that their great strength lay, not in being learned men or eloquent preachers, but in being faithful and *accredited* ministers of *the* Catholic Church. She did not undervalue learning, or talent, or eloquence; but she made all these things not principals, but accessaries, in her grand work of subjugation; she made use of each in its proper place, and rendered even enthusiasm and fanaticism serviceable by directing them into channels favourable to her power.

These elements developed themselves in the mendicant and other orders of friars; and the Roman Church, instead of suppressing them and thereby turning their arms against her own bosom, stamped them with her mark, and sent them forth under direction imperceptible to them, but not the less irresistible, to do her work.

These three causes, viz., a lofty and uncompromising assumption of apostolical authority, an intimate connection with *all* classes of society, and the power of adapting even the fiercest prejudices to serviceable ends, have combined to give both stability and extension to the Romish apostacy; and because one of these was in abeyance, viz., the claim to apostolical authority, and another never possessed, viz., the power of enlisting prejudices, the Church of England daily lost ground, even though she did enjoy what Paley considered the great advantage of an intimate connection with all classes of society.

The Church was then like an infant; mature in point of age she undoubtedly was, but since the Reformation her powers had lain dormant, her faculties undeveloped, she knew not what she could do. Her present position gave her but little claim on the respect or the gratitude of the laity, and the only reason that she continued undisturbed was, because her rivals were as lethargic as herself.

It was under these circumstances that the great revival of religion took place, in which Wesley, and Whitefield, and Lady Huntingdon, and their companions, took so distinguished a part; nor can we be surprised that the clergy, who were not respected for their office, nor revered (generally speaking) for their characters, sunk gradually into disrepute, at least among spiritually-minded men. No stress had been laid on apostolical authority; every man had been allowed to form his own creed, and now, therefore, there was a contest in public opinion between the

slothful and apathetic clergyman, and the zealous and enthusiastic sectary.

But while apathy seemed the distinguishing feature of the British priesthood, it must not be forgotten that the revival of religion took place as well *within* as without the pale of the Establishment; and we have in former numbers detailed at length the causes which gave sectarianism an undue apparent prominence. The revival was not confined to schismatics, and it has gone on gradually but steadily increasing, till now the vast majority of the clergy are so correct in their conduct, and so spiritual in their preaching, that, *as a body*, they are not only highly respectable, but *highly respected.*

A change like this could work but one effect—to belong to a highly respected body, must reflect on the individual member some distinction, for the sake of the body, and thus the first step is taken in the change alluded to. The principle is not the true one, but room is given for the true principle to develope itself; and he who respects the minister of God, because the body to which he belongs is respectable, will soon learn to respect him for his apostolic commission.

It would be needless to go over again the ground which, in the present, and the three preceding numbers of this Review, we have taken as to the authority of the Church and the commission of her ministers. We will but remark, that the *office* of a clergyman is now gradually recovering its consideration, and, thanks to the earnest searching into antiquity now more and more encouraged, the relation of the minister to his flock bids fair to be clearly and extensively understood. But while an advance so gratifying and so important is made in one respect, the Church has lost one of her old advantages: she no longer reaches so easily and effectually *all* classes of her members as she once did. She does, indeed, claim and support her apostolic dignity and authority, and has thus recovered one of the weapons which rendered the papacy so mighty; but, at the same time, she has dropped from her grasp another scarcely less important. The very means by which she had regained the one, have caused her to relinquish her hold of the other; and this brings us to the present social position of the Anglican clergy, and the effect the new system has had upon society.

It has long been remarked that the emolument produced by any class of employment is in an inverse ratio to the dignity derivable therefrom. This, however, is now less true than it used to be, seeing that the emoluments of all employments are pretty well curtailed. Still, if a profession, by its nature, confers any

kind of distinction, it will be cheerfully embraced by many who would not willingly have committed themselves to one more profitable, but less gentlemanlike: thus there are hundreds who would rather live on two hundred a-year as a physician or a barrister, than make five hundred behind the counter of a grocer or a cheesemonger. We do not defend this feeling; nay, in many cases, we utterly despise it, because it is a ridiculous affectation in the parties who profess it. To see the son of a shopkeeper sneer at trade, and perhaps despise the industry which enabled his respectable father to make a fortune and will only enable him to make a fool, is disgusting in the extreme; but since the feeling—justifiable in some parties, and unjustifiable in others—does exist, we must take its existence into our account, and deal with it accordingly.

The superior social position of the younger clergy has had the necessary effect of rendering the profession more popular—has thrown an increased and increasing number of candidates into the field, and thereby raised the standard of admission. First, a degree of classical information was required—then an especial training under approved masters—then a residence in some specified institution—then an University degree. This last requirement augmented the number of students at Oxford and Cambridge, and thus raised, first the qualifications for the degree, and then the qualifications for admission; all these changes tended to advance the already great respectability of the clergy, and to induce a higher class of men to take on themselves the inferior offices of the Church. The increased expenses, too, of the Universities have had a similar working, by gradually making the body of the clergy not only more respectable, but more aristocratic.

The consequence of this has been in one respect good, and in another evil: the tone of manners and the tone of feeling has been raised in the ecclesiastical body, but an unwillingness —nay, an unfitness has been induced to mingle freely among the class of shopkeepers and persons in similar station. Now, so far as the community is to be regarded as having great power and exercising great influence, *these* are the persons who form the bulk of it; and the Church loses much by having no order of ministers who *can*, or no order of ministers who *will*, enter into *friendly* relations with such among those who want no relief in a pecuniary point of view, who want no advice as to their temporal affairs (at least not from the clergy). It is the *friend* of the family whose voice is listened to—whose opinion is laid up in the chambers of memory—whose counsel is *sought* in times

of doubt—and there is no such thing as *condescending* to be the friend of the family.

The young man who is accustomed to the refinements and the quiet elegance of good society entertains not the slightest objection to visit, relieve, counsel, comfort, and soothe the poor and distressed: this is at once felt to be a duty and a privilege. If he happen to live in a place where the wealthier orders think fit to take notice of him, which in the country is frequently the case, he has as much *society* as he chooses to accept. The classes, however, to which we have before alluded are not those with whom he *can* associate. They may respect him as their minister, may consider him a good preacher, and a sound divine, and a learned man; but he belongs to a different order, and they feel but little interest in him. He is not their *friend*, nor the friend of their friend; he has not the advantages nor the influence over them which are to be obtained by intimacy; they see him on Sunday, and at no other time. On the other hand, the dissenting minister is one of themselves—his associates are of their own class; they meet him here at dinner and there at tea, and he has opportunities innumerable of inculcating his sentiments—opportunities which he does not lose. *Half the converts to Dissent are gained in society, not at the meeting-house;* and it is not till the poison has half, and more than half, done its work, that the already schismatic is induced by his companion to *go and sit under our friend* Mr. So-and-so.

Now it will be very easy to say that the clergy are in truth taken out of all classes—from the nobleman who takes his honorary degree of M.A., after two years wearing of gold and purple, to the servitor who brings up the dishes to the college table; but all are educated alike, and the lowest born and lowest bred give themselves at the Universities the most magnificent airs, and impertinently call the townspeople (whose station is often far superior to that of their own parents) *snobs*.

The mischief, therefore, is not obviated by the son of the small farmer or the small tradesman being enabled to pursue his studies at Oxford or Cambridge, and thus to qualify himself for the ministry; for if by natural or acquired feeling the minister cannot, or if by affectation he *will* not, make himself at home with some particular sections of his flock, then that section must either be left "unattached," or some sectarian will step in and annex it to his own "*denomination*."

A plan has been adopted by the Pastoral Aid Society which has met with much opposition, but against which *we* have nothing to allege. It is the employment of laymen, under the direction

of the parochial clergy, to aid in building up the Church. We have already discussed this matter in our Review for July last, and shall therefore only here remark, that if the lay agents are *well chosen*, and with a particular reference to the classes of society we have spoken of, they might indeed be made very useful. At present they are only employed as pioneers of the clergyman among the poor, where, though doubtless they are serviceable, they are only extending the present sphere of the minister's usefulness; they might be the means of opening out an entirely new one for him.

This is a subject so important that we shall not let it drop here; we have wandered far from the novels, which suggested our remarks, but thoughts and plans crowd upon us, and we must, however reluctantly, dismiss them at least for the present, for want of space in which to discuss them.

ART. III.—*The History of England under the House of Stuart, including the Commonwealth.* [A.D. 1603-1688.] *Part I. —James I., Charles I.* Under the Superintendence of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. London: Baldwin and Co. 1840.

IT was with no small surprise that we read, for the first time, the advertisement in the daily papers, announcing the publication of the above work from the pen of Dr. Vaughan; for we were well aware, that a work, embracing the same period, and with a title not very dissimilar, was published by the same author in the year 1831, and we knew that a large supply of that work was still in the market at a very inferior price; numbers, to our knowledge, having been sold to the public at *eight* and *nine* shillings each, though published at the price of *one guinea.* The fact that the price of the former work is still so low is conclusive as to its reception by the public. How the Committee of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge could have been induced to adopt the work in a new form we are at a loss to determine. That the present edition will share the fate of the former we are certain; but that is the Society's affair, not ours: and as a body, acting with the money of the public, they may be able to continue the book on sale without lowering the price.

But lest our readers should imagine that the present work is

of a different character from the former, we copy the title page of the previous edition—"*Memorials of the Stuart Dynasty, including the Constitutional and Ecclesiastical History of England, from the Decease of Queen Elizabeth to the Abdication of James II. By Robert Vaughan, Author of 'The Life and Opinions of Wycliffe,' in two volumes. London.*" As a matter of course the work has been re-modelled, and re-written, and somewhat enlarged; but the same views are enforced and the same circumstances are detailed. It could not indeed be otherwise. To publish a second edition, while the former remained unsold, would not have been a politic step for the Society: it became necessary, therefore, to adopt a new title. That the eyes of the public will not be open to the trick we cannot for one moment imagine. The circumstance will form a curious incident for some future D'Israeli, in detailing the literary history of the former half of the nineteenth century: he will recount the particulars of the reprint of a work under a new title, while the former edition remained unsold. Such a proceeding could not have been adopted by an individual publisher, much less by an author: it could only be adopted by a Society trading with the money of the public, who, if they lose on one work, make up their loss on another. The present, however, is the first instance of the kind in the literary history of our country, and we are of opinion that it will be the last; for on the one hand, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that *The Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge* will be permitted to resort to such a proceeding in future; nor, on the other, can we imagine that any disappointed author will ever meet with another body of men ready to adopt a work rejected by the public, and to present it to the world under a new form. It would be an act of policy on the part of the Society to purchase all the remaining copies of the former edition, in order that the way might be the better prepared for the reception of the present. Having made our readers aware of the facts of the case, and having exposed the arts which have so evidently been practised for the purpose of inducing the belief that the present is an entirely new work, we shall now proceed to an examination of some of the author's statements.

One thing is very remarkable in reading histories by modern Dissenters: we allude to the soft and gentle terms in which they speak of the Church of Rome, and of her members—a circumstance which must strike every one who compares the works of Calamy and Neal, the great Dissenting authorities of a former age, with those of such men as Dr. Price and Dr.

Vaughan. Popery is the same now as it was in the days of Calamy, and the change must therefore be sought for in the views of the Dissenters. That such a change *has* taken place is a fact which no reasonable man will dispute. We may select two points as sufficient evidence. Calamy and Neal always speak respectfully of the Church of England, and with abhorrence of the unscriptural principles of the Church of Rome: but modern Dissenters adopt the opposite course—they speak softly of the errors of Rome, and with the greatest bitterness of the Church of England. The truth of this position may be ascertained by any one who will take the trouble to institute a comparison of the works which we have mentioned. Dr. Vaughan invariably uses the term *Catholic* in speaking of the Romanists, though he *must* know that it is altogether inapplicable, and that by so doing he is actually condemning himself and his party; since if the term can be exclusively applied to the members of the Romish Church, the Dissenters are not Catholics. Is Dr. Vaughan prepared to admit that the term does not belong to his own body? We apprehend that he is not: yet by his application of it in these volumes he virtually excludes himself and all Protestants, whether Dissenters or members of the Anglican Church, from the pale of that holy Catholic Church in which *we*, as Churchmen, profess to believe. It is singular, that in speaking of the Church of Rome, the Dissenters invariably adopt the same terms as are used by our Whig and Radical politicians. Their conduct reminds us of a certain Whig peer who, on presenting a clergyman to a living, begged him to be on good terms with the Dissenters in his parish; yet the peer himself was careless respecting both. The Dissenters, like the noble lord, wish to be on good terms with the Papists, and to accomplish this object they can use terms which involve a compromise of the most sacred principles. The period embraced in these volumes is one of the most important in our history. It was a period when strong feelings and prejudices were called into operation. The Church of England was trampled on by a set of men of whom it is scarcely possible for ordinary readers to form an accurate estimate. Is Dr. Vaughan the proper person to treat of this period in a history for popular use, and to be employed by a Society? He or any other man has an undoubted right to put forth his own opinions on any subject on his own responsibility; but when those opinions are put forth by a Society, whose professed object is to furnish the middle and lower classes with accurate information respecting the history of their country, the public have a right to

canvass the motives of the parties by whom the work is published. Looking at Dr. Vaughan's former edition, for the present work can be viewed only as a second, we hesitate not to pronounce him to be utterly disqualified for the task which he has undertaken; nor can we avoid the conclusion, that the Society have incurred an immense weight of responsibility in sending forth a work in which so many matters connected more especially with the Anglican Church are so greatly misrepresented. The *Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge* would have the credit of putting forth statements that will bear the strictest investigation, and which are, in fact, strictly true; but that they have lent their sanction to assertions which cannot be proved, or that they have been deceived by Dr. Vaughan, will appear from an examination of these volumes. To enter upon all the important topics discussed by the author is not practicable; we shall therefore make our selection as a sample, giving such extracts as may enable our readers to form their own conclusions.

One of the earliest ecclesiastical topics discussed in the volumes before us is the Hampton Court conference, which, as our readers well know, was assembled for the purpose of considering those objections which the Puritans had, throughout the reign of Elizabeth, alleged against certain ceremonies retained in the Anglican Church. As soon almost as James had arrived in England, a petition was presented to him, signed by about seven hundred and fifty persons, calling for certain alterations in the Book of Common Prayer. Dr. Vaughan says, that the number of signatures was upwards of eight hundred. This, however, is a slight mistake. It was called the millenary petition, because the parties boasted that it had received the signatures of nearly a thousand clergymen; and to this petition the Hampton Court conference owed its origin. The petitioners, it should be remarked, were beneficed clergymen in the Anglican Church—men who had hitherto conformed, at least in part, to her worship and discipline, and who had sworn that the things against which they objected, were good and lawful. Dr. Vaughan, in complaining of Barlow's account of the conference, says—

"It limits the complaints of the Puritans to a few comparatively trivial particulars, and fails to convey any adequate impression of the nature of the reasoning with which the leaders among those people were always prepared to advocate those principles. A dignitary, who was present, wrote on the following day to a female relative in the country, and stated among other things that the Puritan representatives 'made much stir about the Book of Common Prayer, and subscription

to it,' objecting to '*all* the ceremonies, and *every point* in it.'"—Vol. i. p. 23.

This passage demands some notice; and it will be seen that the insinuations which it conveys are quite sufficient to destroy the credit of Dr. Vaughan as an impartial historian. The writer in Winwood, whom Dr. Vaughan quotes, obviously wished to make it appear that the Puritan objections were more numerous than they really were; and our author, not willing to admit that they objected merely to a few ceremonies, would insinuate, that they went much farther than they are usually represented as going. Baxter, and Calamy, and Neal, concur in stating, that the objections of the Puritans were very few; indeed, no fact in history is better substantiated than this; and they actually use this fact as an argument against the Church for not giving way to the scruples of the petitioners. Dr. Vaughan, therefore, is not only opposed to the truth in this matter, but his statement is directly at variance with those of the strongest advocates of the Puritans. Our readers may feel some surprise to find our author differing from Neal and Calamy, but the matter is verly easily explained. Dissent is a very different thing from Puritanism and Nonconformity. In the term *Puritans* we include those who objected to the ceremonies from the Reformation down to the period of the restoration: in the term *Nonconformists*, those who quitted the Church at the restoration, and also those who continued in their refusal to conform to the period of the revolution in 1688; and from this latter era all those who have refused to conform have been comprehended under the general term *Dissenters*. There was no temptation in those days to a Churchman to diminish the number of the Puritan objections; on the contrary, he would be inclined, supposing him *not* to be an impartial writer, to make it appear that their scruples extended to more points than were really contemplated by themselves. The system of independency was, however, held in perfect abhorrence by the Puritans at the Hampton Court conference, and this is the very system now universally adopted by Dissenters as the only one warranted by the Word of God and the practice of the primitive Church.

But let us, for the sake of argument, admit Dr. Vaughan's assertion, that the Puritans, at this conference, scrupled many more things than are usually supposed, and what is the consequence? Is it not one which Dr. Vaughan, as an historian, must shrink from, namely, that they were dishonest men in conforming to ceremonies to *all* of which they objected? If their objections were as numerous as Dr. Vaughan insinuates, or

if they extended to matters of greater moment than those actually expressed in the millenary petition, and stated at the conference, we could scarcely give them credit for sincerity.

Now it appears to us that the writer who insinuates what is false is more guilty than he who comes boldly forward and broadly asserts it. In the latter case, few persons would be likely to be led astray, while in the former some might be induced to credit the writer.

Having made this insinuation, Dr. Vaughan proceeds to attack Barlow's account of the conference. To do so was necessary, after his statement respecting the extent of the Puritanical scruples. But let us hear his own words :—

"The Puritans might easily have supplied the deficiencies, or corrected the mistakes of the accounts of this conference which emanated from the court; but to have done so would have been to exasperate the king, and must have involved the ministers principally concerned in difficulties, which in our better times are happily little understood. It was deemed better, therefore, to leave his Majesty in possession of his fancied triumph, and the prelates to reap the fruits of their pitiable sycophancy and impiety, in which, according to the narrative of Barlow himself, it was their pleasure to indulge."—i. p. 23.*

Dr. Vaughan deals largely in insinuations and assertions, but is very sparing in his facts. The public, however, will expect a narrative of facts, not a string of inferences, and of inferences too which are not justified by the premises. The above extract may be taken as a specimen of our author's mode of substituting his own gratuitous assertions for historical facts. It will also shew that Dr. Vaughan is not a writer to be trusted—that his statements must not be taken for granted; and when submitted to the test of an examination, they will be found wanting in that quality, without which history is but a fable, namely,—TRUTH.

It is asserted in this extract that the Puritans could have supplied the deficiencies of Barlow's account, but that they were restrained from such a course by certain politic considerations. Now we ask, on what authority does Dr. Vaughan rest this assertion? He cites not one, so that it rests on his own unsup-

* The following extract relating to the same subject in the author's former edition, which still remains unsold, may amuse the reader—at all events it will shew that the present work is nothing more than a reprint, though the writer has, in a measure, recast his sentences: "The Puritans, who complained of being grossly misrepresented in the narrative sent forth by Dean Barlow, might have supplied the deficiencies of that publication, and have corrected its mistakes; but they appear to have considered it more prudent to submit to the consequences of that partial statement, than to attempt an exposure of the ribaldry and abuse in which James was pleased to found his pretensions to a signal victory."—*Memorials of the Stuart Dynasty*, vol. i. 105.

ported statement. He would lead his readers to believe that Barlow's account was very defective and partial. Now we are prepared to shew, that Barlow's account was as correct as such an account was likely to be; and that the Puritans had nothing to supply. They may have failed at the conference in alleging all their objections; but this is not the question, for it relates merely to the fact, whether Barlow's narrative of what actually took place is faithful and worthy of credit. We are ready to meet Dr. Vaughan on this ground; and we defy him to adduce a single particle of evidence in support of his assertions and insinuations respecting Barlow's narrative. How does Dr. Vaughan know that the Puritans could have given a different account of the conference? Whence did he derive his information? No account from the pen of a Puritan exists: nor can it be proved that any of the parties at the conference ever said that he could give a different account. We are ready to admit that Barlow had his leanings and his partialities; for where is the writer who is free from some kind of bias? but neither Dr. Vaughan nor any other Dissenter can prove that the facts are misrepresented, or that the arguments, on the side of the Puritans, are not honestly stated. That the contest between the Puritan ministers and the king and his prelates was an unequal one, may be admitted without questioning the veracity of Barlow. The Puritan divines never attempted to correct any errors; they did not commit an account of the conference to writing, a thing which they could easily have accomplished; for though they might not have felt themselves at liberty to publish it, yet they might certainly have handed it about in manuscript among their friends. No such manuscript account exists; nor is there, in the writings of that and the subsequent period, any mention of such a document. The conclusion from these facts is irresistible, namely, that Barlow's narrative *is* substantially correct.

What then will our readers think of Dr. Vaughan as a writer of English history? And what will they think of the society by whom, in this instance, he has been employed? Any historical work proceeding from the pen of Dr. Vaughan, or any work sent forth under the auspices of *The Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge* must, if it relate to matters ecclesiastical, be viewed with suspicion. This is a harsh censure; but it is more than justified by the erroneous statements of the present volumes.

This *veracious* Doctor has, moreover, charged the Bishops with impiety for the part which they took in the conferences; but no particulars are specified. Is this the way in which a public society should proceed in furnishing books for popular reading?

It is not our object to detail the proceedings of the Hampton Court conference: but there are a few incidents, relating to King James, which shew that he could be witty on occasions, and that he was by no means so poor a reasoner as some of his Majesty's accusers, in modern days, would lead men to believe. When the Apocryphal books were objected to by the Puritans, and the book *Ecclesiasticus* was particularly specified, the king, turning to the lords, remarked—"What trow ye makes these men so angry with Ecclesiasticus: by my soul, I think he was a bishop, or else they would never use him so." And on another occasion when Knewstubs, one of the Puritan ministers, said, "I take exception at the wearing of the surplice, a kind of garment used by the priests of Isis," the king immediately retorted, —"Surely I did not think till of late that it had been borrowed from the heathen, because it is commonly termed a rag of popery, in scorn." It is not to be wondered at that James was flattered by his courtiers, for in this conference he was by no means a contemptible disputant. Dr. Vaughan may call the king's arguments *ribaldry*, but there is no trace of any thing of the kind in Barlow's account, unless, indeed, he would thus characterise the passages which we have just quoted.

Dr. Vaughan, however, is obliged to admit, "That the Puritan ministers were abashed in so unusual a presence, and on such unequal terms, so as not to have acquitted themselves with their accustomed ability and courage, may be supposed" (p. 23). This we allow: but this is no proof that they were improperly treated. Whether they were inferior or not to their accustomed reputation, it does not appear that they have been misrepresented in the matter. Charges like these are not to be received on Dr. Vaughan's bare word. Fuller, an authority often praised by our author, remarks, "how discreetly the king carried himself, posterity (out of the reach of flattery) is the most competent judge. It is generally said that herein he went above himself; that the Bishop of London even with himself; and Dr. Rainolds fell much beneath himself."*

Dr. Vaughan, like all Dissenting historians, censures the Church of England for refusing to concede all the points objected to by the Puritans. Now, it should be remembered that it was just as reasonable for the Bishops and others to be heard in defence of the ceremonies, as for the Puritans to be heard against them. It was as reasonable that the surplice and the use of the cross should be retained at the request of the bishops, as that

* Fuller, x. 21.

they should be rejected at the request of the Puritan clergy. Besides, is it certain that the concession of all the points in debate would have given satisfaction, or that the objectors would not have been emboldened to demand others still more important? In all such cases a limit must be set somewhere: and it is fair and reasonable that the minority should yield to the wishes of the majority. It is not argued by the Puritans, that the usages in dispute were sinful: consequently they could not complain that they were not relinquished.*

Our author soon after commences a violent attack on the canons of 1604. And here, again, the public have reason to complain of the Society for the Diffusion of *Useful* Knowledge in not submitting to the world a statement of facts, but the inferences, insinuations, and assertions of Dr. Vaughan! With respect to the canons of 1604, the honest course would have been to have stated fairly all the particulars respecting them, leaving the public to form their own conclusions. Has this rule been adhered to in the work before us? Let the following passage testify:

"In the memorable convocation of 1604, nearly a hundred and fifty regulations on Church matters were agreed to, almost without the appearance of deliberation. All these enactments breathed more or less of the spirit of intolerance; and, what is more, are unrepealed to this day."—p. 40.

The canons of 1604 partake of the spirit of the times, but they are quite as moderate as the publications of the Puritans of that day, or as those of the Presbyterians of a later date. All parties agreed that it was necessary that one form of ecclesiasti-

* We are inclined to believe that Dr. Vaughan never carefully read Barlow's account—nay more, that he never saw it, but that all the knowledge he has of it has been derived from extracts in other authors. There is a note of reference which stands thus: "*Barlow's Account of the Conference at Hampton Court in the 'Phœnix Brittannicus.*" He then gives an extract, and refers to the same volume, pp. 162, 163. Now let it be observed that Barlow's account is not printed in the "Phœnix Brittannicus" at all. It is printed in the "Phœnix," a work published in two volumes octavo, 1707, 1708: and the passage alluded to by Dr. Vaughan occurs in the first volume of this work, at the pages specified in his note. The "Phœnix Brittannicus" is a totally different work, and was published in 4to. 1732, and Barlow's account is not contained in it. It is clear, therefore, that Dr. Vaughan never saw either of these works. He had heard the names: but he supposes that they are one and the same. By referring to the "Phœnix Brittannicus," and by citing pages which tally with the "Phœnix" he has proved to the world that he took his extract at second hand, though he would have it appear that he had actually read Barlow's account as printed in the "Phœnix." A copy of Barlow's work, as first published, the "Phœnix," and the "Phœnix Brittannicus" are now lying on our table, and therefore we are enabled to speak with authority in this matter.

cal government should serve for the whole country, and that all must be compelled to submit. Excommunication, therefore, was not confined to the Church of England; for had the Puritans succeeded in their efforts to alter the discipline of the Church, they would have proceeded against all offenders with far more rigour than was practised by the Bishops. It is quite sufficient to remark, that the canons of 1604 are as moderate as any ecclesiastical regulations of any religious party in that or the next age.

But these canons are unrepealed! and Dr. Vaughan would insinuate that they are still carried into effect upon all who dissent from the Anglican Church. How then comes it to pass that he is permitted to preach where, and when, and what doctrines he pleases, without any interruption from the bishops or the Ecclesiastical Courts? Perhaps he may allege that it is highly inconsistent not to repeal them; but let not the Church be blamed for this. They can only be repealed or modified by convocation; and the convocation is not permitted to assemble: nor is it likely that the present Government, of whom Dr. Vaughan is an admirer, will permit them.

But the canons of 1604 are only binding in certain cases which may be specified: namely, when not repugnant to the supremacy of the sovereign nor the laws of the land. According to this rule, therefore, all the canons, to which Dr. Vaughan applies his remarks, are virtually repealed by acts of Parliament, to which acts the Church of England, at all events, was a party consenting. That they have not been *formally* repealed is admitted; but this formal repeal could not be accomplished except in convocation.

Of course the various primates of the Anglican Church under the Stuarts, with, indeed, the exception of Abbot, meet with no favour from our author. They are all held up as a set of merciless persecutors. Dr. Vaughan is not satisfied with stating facts; he puts his own construction on them, and insinuates charges which are destitute of any foundation. Bancroft, whose works against the Puritans are noticed in a note, is described as a cruel persecutor; and yet Bancroft did no more than was done by John Knox and his brethren in Scotland, and by the Puritan leaders in England. The writers of the "Martin-Marprelate Tracts" are much more violent in their tone than Bancroft; but the latter was a Bishop, and therefore a proper object for abuse.

The Society is pledged, even by its very name, to circulate only *useful knowledge*, and, consequently, in historical matters,

to inculcate nothing which is not literally and strictly TRUE! How widely they have departed from their avowed object is apparent, and will be still more apparent as we proceed.

Dr. Vaughan has admitted that the principles of the Brownists were nearly similar to those which are now held by our English Dissenters—a fact which some persons are not willing to allow. After giving copious extracts from a "Defence of the Brownists," he adds—

"These extracts will not be deemed uninstructive, if it be borne in mind that the reasonings and opinions which they exhibit are, in substance, those of the principal sects during the time of the civil war and the commonwealth, and of the greater portion of Dissenters from our Established Church to the present day. These passages are also valuable as affording just views of the peculiarities of a people concerning whom little is recorded by our historians, and who, while they were to exert a powerful influence in the completion of English history in the next age, have been subject to every sort of misrepresentation. Religious sects have often made their appearance and passed away without producing any impression on their own or future times. But such was not the case with these parties."—p. 129.

Thus it is admitted, that Dissent had its origin in Brownism, and Brownism, or the principles designated by that term, were then perfectly new. They had never been heard of in the world, and could not, therefore, have proceeded from the apostles. The Brownists were opposed by the Puritans and the Presbyterians with quite as much rigour as by the Bishops. All concurred in the condemnation of their principles, as those which had never before been known. The inference is evident; namely, that the views of Dissenters, in matters of discipline, are novel, having no foundation in holy Scripture or the practices of the primitive Church. Every one knows that one of the grand features of Dissent is, the permission for any small number of persons to form what is called "a Church," without any reference to the body from whom they separate. Five or six persons may quit a Dissenting congregation, and, on the principles acted on and avowed by all Dissenters, as being at the very foundation of their system, they are competent to form "a Church;" nor can the party or congregation from whom they separate charge them with schism, because the seceding members have an equal right with those who remain to act for themselves, to build a chapel, and appoint their minister. This fact is a proof that the system is unscriptural; for it is as clear as the sun at noonday, that the apostle did not conceive that the professors at Corinth were at liberty to separate from the body and

form their own congregations. Such separatists were by St. Paul deemed to be guilty of schism. There was a Church planted in Corinth, and those who quitted it were cut off from the body of the faithful; but, on the principles of Dissent, a Church may exist in a town or a village, and any persons are at liberty to separate from it and form another assembly, which also is designated "a Church." Such a system is not the system of the New Testament. Whatever, therefore, may be the doctrinal views of Dissenters, their practice, in separating from a Church which can establish, and has established, her claim to apostolicity, is, to all intents and purposes, schismatic, and consequently unscriptural. Their creed may be sound, but their conduct is opposed to the Word of God. With their views and doctrines we have no concern, but respecting their opinions on discipline and Church government, there can be but one opinion among those who are determined to adhere to that system which is revealed in Holy Scripture, and sanctioned by the practice of the apostolic age.

Dr. Vaughan hesitates not to assert, that King James was not disinclined to popery, or what meaning can be attached to the following passage:—"The true spring of this Protestant zeal on the part of the king, no doubt, was his vanity in such matters." It is rather singular that a man like Dr. Vaughan, who fraternizes with Papists in the present day, should insinuate such a charge against King James. Is it vanity that prompts Dr. Vaughan to oppose the Church of England, and to write books in support of Dissent? May it be said that *vanity* is the true spring of our author's Dissenting zeal? He would be indignant at such an insinuation! Yet would it not be quite as fair for us to allege such a charge, as for him to attack the character of James on such a subject? Dissenting writers should be very careful in alleging the charge of popery, when their own conduct in forming alliances with Papists is so very shifting and ambiguous.

Our readers are aware that the *first* clause in the XXth Article, has been the subject of dispute on various occasions. The matter is thus stated in the present work:—

"Listening to counsels from that quarter, Charles, as head of the Church, had lately issued a new edition of the Articles, containing a clause which declared, that the 'Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and hath authority in *matters* of faith;' and setting forth that the settlement of all controversies with respect to discipline and worship, and the true meaning of the said Articles, belonged of right to the houses of convocation. This very material clause had no

place in the book of Articles published under Edward VI., nor in the edition made authoritative by act of Parliament in 1571. After that period, it was sometimes inserted and sometimes omitted in the authorised copies, but in no instance had it obtained the sanction of the Legislature. The edition which made its appearance in 1628 came forth under the superintendence of Laud, and the disputed clause, as it was natural to expect, was then introduced."—Vol. i. p. 246.

The reader must bear in mind that the work in question is published by a Society which has assumed the appellation of "The Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge." If, indeed, these volumes had been published by Dr. Vaughan on his own account, we should not have deemed it necessary to expose his errors, believing that in that case they would have been harmless, and that the book would have fallen to the ground like the former edition. When, however, an influential Society sanctions the publication of a work—a Society, too, whose aim it is to diffuse knowledge among the common people—it becomes a duty on the part of the press to guard the public against receiving *as true* what is so egregiously erroneous.

In the first place, Dr. Vaughan has mis-quoted the Article; whether from ignorance or from design, it is not for us to determine. In either case, however, he is not duly qualified to write history. The clause stands thus in the Article:—"The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in *controversies* of faith." Why, then, should the author substitute words which do not occur in the Article? How, indeed, could he reason upon the question, unless he had first ascertained what were the precise words in which the clause was couched. It would seem that the author quoted from some other Dissenter, for the same error has been put forth by former writers of the same school. The public will know how to appreciate the assertions of a man who can misquote a clause which he is about to attack.

But, secondly, the reader would gather from the preceding extract, that the disputed clause had no existence in any edition of the Articles prior to the year 1571. No dispute arose on the subject until 1628, when Laud procured a new edition to be published containing it. As soon as it appeared it was attacked by the Puritans; and from that time to the present the question has been more or less agitated. The clause, however, does occur before the year 1571.

Alluding to the alleged projected departure of Cromwell, Hampden and some others, at the period immediately preceding the commencement of the civil war, our author remarks:—

"Their departure was prevented by the interposition of Laud. It is probable that to these prohibitions England owes her present freedom; its men of enterprise, of public spirit, and of sincere piety, being detained by these means to perform their part in the great struggle, which, though not then foreseen even by the most sagacious, was near at hand. But what shall we say of that intolerance, which not only bound its yoke without pity on the necks of its victims at home, but refused them the poor relief of a dangerous and distant exile because it could not press the same yoke upon them there? *The revocation of the Edict of Nantz was an act of forbearance compared with such proceedings.*"—Vol. i. 276.

It is said that these individuals wished to make their way to New England, in order that they might enjoy their liberty in the new world. Many Independents, to which party these men belonged, if they belonged to any, had already settled in America; and instead of shewing themselves to be the friends of liberty, they actually imposed a heavier yoke upon the necks of others than that which was imposed upon their own in England.

Dr. Vaughan thinks that we owe our present liberties to the refusal to permit Cromwell and others to quit the country. This is, indeed, a discovery in our history! Can it be possible that any one, in the nineteenth century, should be rash enough to affirm that we are in any way indebted for our liberties to Oliver Cromwell, who, like Napoleon Buonaparte, was the sworn enemy of freedom and the supporter of one of the severest military despotisms ever seen in the world? Verily, *The Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge* could never have given their sanction to such a monstrous proposition, nor can they fail to remove the book from their lists.

We have further to remark, that the act of preventing the parties in question from leaving the country can scarcely be branded as an act of persecution. Such a line of policy has frequently been pursued by states and kingdoms; nor can it, with reason, be pleaded that the government of Charles I. were not justified in adopting such a step at that particular juncture. Into the justice of the proceeding, however, we need not enter. Admitting that the individuals were hardly used in being prevented from quitting the country, it cannot be denied that they took the most ample vengeance on those who were the cause of their detention. Laud soon fell a sacrifice to their fury; and the king himself perished on the scaffold, while Cromwell died in his bed in one of the royal palaces, which, though the child of liberty, according to Dr. Vaughan, he had most iniquitously seized upon. The tables were, therefore, completely turned in a very few years: yet this writer feels no sympathy for Charles I. though he *can* sympathise with his murderers, and declare

that we owe our present liberties to their efforts! In speaking of the death of the king, Dr. Vaughan's virtuous indignation is not at all roused; but it is soon excited when he comes to speak of those who were the means of bringing him to the block.

The last clause, however, in the preceding extract is the most remarkable—the clause in *italics.* The *italics* are ours; and we wish to direct especial attention to it. *The revocation of the Edict of Nantz was nothing in comparison of the detention of Cromwell, Hampden, and others in their own country!* If we did not feel the vast importance of the subject, and the responsibility incurred by the Society by whom such monstrous sentiments are promulgated, we should be inclined to smile at such an assertion. But when we call to mind the fact that this passage is put forth under the name of a public Society, we cannot but feel that the matter is too grave to admit of a smile.

During the administration of ecclesiastical affairs by Laud, certain measures were adopted to enforce conformity, and to prevent persons from holding benefices who were opposed to the ceremonies and government of the Church. There were certain clergymen who never read the Common Prayer, but acted as lecturers, others reading for them. For endeavouring to impose a check upon such unseemly practices, Laud is censured by Dr. Vaughan, as if the measure had a tendency to introduce Popery—(see pp. 283, 284.) Popery, however, made more rapid advances during the period of the Commonwealth than during the primacy of Laud. How does Dr. Vaughan account for this, for it is an undoubted fact? A very few remarks will be sufficient to place the question of the lecturers in its proper light. That the clergy in many instances evaded conformity, though their consciences permitted them to hold preferments in the Church, is a well established fact. At the period of the Hampton Court conference many irregularities were practised in this matter: they were alluded to by Bancroft during the conference:—

"It is come to that passe (says he) that some sort of men thought it the only dutie required of a minister to spend the time in speaking out of a pulpit—sometimes, God wot, very indiscreetly and unlearnedly; and this with so great injury and prejudice to the celebration of divine service, that some ministers could be content to walke in the churchyard all sermon time, rather than to be present at publike prayer."*

It is clear from this extract that many of the Puritans altogether slighted the services of the Church. During the reign of Elizabeth, the irregularity had more or less prevailed; and

* Hallam's Const. Hist. Vol. i. 293.

the practice was still more common when Laud was promoted to the metropolitan dignity. It was natural, therefore, that he should endeavour to rectify the evil. The cause of such irregular practices is easily explained:—when a clergyman in possession of a living entertained scruples on the subject of the Liturgy, he usually engaged a curate who could conscientiously comply with all the requirements of the Church. The whole of the service, in such cases, with the exception of preaching, was left to the curate. Some of the scrupulous clergy were content to be present during the prayers, provided they were not called upon themselves to perform the duty of reading them; but others carried their opposition so far, that they would not even be present at the obnoxious service. The ministers of the latter class, therefore, did not enter the Church until it was time to ascend the pulpit; yet these very men had sworn to conform to all things prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. To us it appears that Laud pursued a wise and judicious course in putting an end to a system which was calculated to bring into contempt not merely the services of the Church, but religion itself. It is unreasonable to hold up his conduct in this matter to censure, for he did no more than he was bound to do in the high office which he was called to fill.

We do not intend to enter now on the question of the divine right of any form of Church government; we are satisfied with that of our own Church, and convinced that it corresponds with the apostolic model. But at the same time, we cannot pass by certain assertions of Dr. Vaughan's on this subject. Alluding to the Presbytery of Scotland, he remarks—"When the Anglican Church spoke of her bishops as such by divine right, and as essential to the existence of a Christian Church, it was not unnatural that the Scottish Church should begin to broach pretensions on the side of her Presbyters." (p. 291.) The author, in this passage, pretends that the Scotch Presbyterians were induced to plead for the divine right of their system by the lofty claims of the bishops respecting episcopacy. Into the abstract question we cannot now enter; but is it a fact, that the Presbyterians did not set up their divine right until the example had been set them by the Episcopalians? On the contrary—the Presbyterians took the lead in this matter. The English reformers and their successors, indeed, asserted the *apostolic origin* of episcopacy; but they never asserted it in such extravagant terms as were employed by the Presbyterians in speaking of presbytery. And so far is Dr. Vaughan from being correct in this statement, that he is flatly contradicted by a much abler

writer than himself, in a work which will be perused when "The History of England under the House of Stuart" shall be forgotten: we allude to Mr. Hallam.

Whether the members of the Anglican Church are in prosperity or in adversity, they are, according to Dr. Vaughan, always in error. He condemns their proceedings towards the Puritans in enforcing conformity, and when they are oppressed by the Presbyterians and the Parliament, he approves of the course which is pursued towards them, and labours to traduce their character in order that he may find a pretence for justifying the measures of their enemies. Thus, after all the abuse heaped upon the bishops and clergy during the reigns of Elizabeth and James, he persists in his course when he undertakes to narrate their sufferings. In speaking of the conduct of the Parliament towards those ministers who had been silenced for non-conformity, Dr. Vaughan remarks:—

"By the authority of a committee appointed for the purpose, a great number of the clergy who had been silenced, imprisoned, or deprived of their livings, on the ground or pretence of non-conformity, were restored, and in some cases the functionaries who had subjected them to such penalties, were obliged to make pecuniary restitution to the sufferers. This proceeding has been described as arbitrary, and as not strictly within the province of the House of Commons. The livings of these men were regarded as their freeholds: the grounds of their expulsion were adjudged illegal, as having more respect to innovations brought in by the ruling clergy, than to the conformity required by law; and to examine and correct these instances of misrule was regarded as belonging to the supreme authority pertaining to the high court of Parliament."—p. 318.

Now we call upon the author to establish his position that the number of the silenced clergy before the civil wars was *great.* He has made the assertion in a book intended for popular use; but he has cited no authority whatever. We tell him that his assertion is not founded on fact. It is not true that the number of silenced ministers was great; for, notwithstanding the scruples of the Puritans, they contrived, except in a comparatively few instances, to retain their livings. The writer also asserts that the ministers who were silenced were silenced not for refusing to conform to the things enjoined by law, but for objecting to certain innovations brought in by the ruling clergy. No authority is cited for this assertion. We, however, can inform our readers, and also Dr. Vaughan and the Society by whom he is patronized, that the statement is directly at variance with the truth. It can be proved, by evidence not to be contradicted, that every clergyman who was silenced, and few only were sub-

jected to that penalty, was silenced, not for a few acts of non-conformity, but for persisting in his course after repeated admonitions. In every case of suspension or deprivation, the individual refused to subscribe to the articles and formularies, and to conform to the ceremonies of the Church. The silenced ministers had taken the oath of canonical obedience, by which they were bound to submit to the ordinary in all lawful matters; and it was the duty of the bishops to see that the laws were observed by the clergy. One would suppose that Dr. Vaughan himself would not sanction the silencing of a clergyman who conformed to the rites and ceremonies; yet in the next paragraph in his History he justifies the removal of clergymen, whose only crime, according to his own admission, was that conformity of which he speaks as being according to law. The preceding extract is, in short, a tissue of falsehoods and inconsistencies.

Let us, however, examine his decision respecting the proceedings of the Parliament in ejecting the regular clergy, and we shall find him as much its champion in this course, as in the matter of the silenced ministers:—

"But it was not enough that these evils should be at once corrected; a committee was formed to prevent the recurrence of them, and to proceed against such of the clergy as disgraced their profession by their vices. These persons were known in the language of the time under the name of 'Scandalous Ministers;' and as they had generally distinguished themselves by their opposition to the Puritans, and by their support of the late unconstitutional policy of the government, they failed not to give out, and their friends failed not to echo the assertion, that it was not so much their scandalous vices as their conscientious principles that had called forth the displeasure of their enemies."—p. 318.

Again, in speaking of "White's Centurie of Scandalous Ministers," the author says—

"Of the hundred included in 'White's First Centurie of Scandalous Ministers,' eighty were convicted, by many witnesses, of gross immoralities, besides their disaffection to the Parliament."—p. 413.

The author insinuates—a practice very usual with him in these volumes—that the clergy ejected were really *scandalous* in their lives, though the facts were never proved against them, with some few exceptions. Will the author take upon himself to say that none were ejected except those who *were* of scandalous lives? If he cannot prove that *all* who were removed from their livings were guilty of immorality, his defence of the Parliament falls to the ground; since the very terms used to designate the ejected clergy fix upon them the brand of scandalous living. No one, we believe, ever pretended that all the clergy

removed by the Parliament were immoral men. If, therefore, one single person was ejected for opposition to the Parliament only, the proceedings of the House of Commons in branding that man as a scandalous liver were most iniquitous. And with regard to "White's" Scandalous "Centurie," we believe that Dr. Vaughan has never examined the book; it is indeed pretty certain that he has never *seen* it. His views have been derived at second hand from some of those dissenting writers whose object it is to blacken the character of the clergy of that period, in order that they may set up some plea of justification for the cruelty and injustice of the Parliament. With few exceptions, and we deny not that there *were* cases of immorality among the clergy in that day—but with few exceptions, the ministers who were ejected by the Parliament were ejected for the unpardonable crime of *malignancy*, and for no other. Discontented and disaffected parishioners were accustomed to denounce their minister, as the best and readiest way of settling an old grudge; and in many cases it was proved that the parties who laid the information were actuated by feelings of hostility to the clergy who had reproved their vices; for the witnesses were generally the men of the worst character in the parish. No witness, however, was rejected. All that could be said against the loyal clergy was admitted to be true. It would appear that Dr. Vaughan views the matter in the same light.

It was the policy of the Parliament in removing the clergy who continued firm in their loyalty to their sovereign, to mingle together various charges besides that of *malignancy*, which was so mixed up with the rest that ordinary observers were led to believe that it was only mentioned incidentally, and that the sequestrations actually took place in consequence of immorality or scandalous living. In every instance mentioned in White's notorious work the charge of *malignancy* is actually specified; so that, according to this author, all the immoral clergy were opposed to the Parliament. Now the men who, as was alleged, were guilty of such crimes as those mentioned by White, would not have been likely to be over scrupulous respecting the party to whom they should adhere in the war. If they were so lost to all right feeling as to be thus guilty, they would have been more likely to have consulted their own interests by joining the stronger party, than to have risked the loss of their livings by adhering to his Majesty. In short, White's book carries with it its own condemnation; for it is unreasonable to suppose, nay impossible to conceive, that immorality and opposition to the Parliament were necessarily connected together, and immorality,

when unaccompanied with malignancy, did not expose a clergyman to ejection from his living. The learning of some of the clergy in the "Centurie" is admitted even by their traducer, White, who says—

"And let not the learning of some few of these men (for which if they had any grace to use it well they were considerable) move thee to think they be hardly dealt with, for learning in a man unsanctified is but a pearle in a swine's snout."

Our readers are prepared to expect that the character of Archbishop Laud would be virulently assailed by a man who could pen such passages as those which we have already submitted to their notice. With respect, indeed, to Laud's death, Dr. Vaughan has out-Heroded Herod himself, for he has actually justified his execution; whereas all respectable writers admit that the step could not be defended:—

"The charge of treason against Laud may not seem to have been clearly sustained in the articles of impeachment preferred against him, but it must be remembered that the man who conspires to defraud the subject of his chartered rights, which it is certain was the case here, must be understood to do so, not merely without the concurrency but against the command of the king. Whether an attempt to destroy the fundamental laws of the kingdom be treason or not, is a question which we shall have occasion presently to consider; but that the conduct of such ministers as the Archbishop of Canterbury makes them justly liable to impeachment is certain."—p. 329.

If this is not an attempt to justify the execution of Laud, we are greatly mistaken. We ask, then, what right have *The Society for the Diffusion of* Useful *Knowledge* to sanction as their own the private opinions of *such a man as Dr. Vaughan?*—opinions which were never held by any respectable writer. Does the Society profess to impart *true* knowledge to the middling classes by circulating direct falsehoods? We would not allude to Laud's panygerists, but we would refer our readers to such writers as Mr. Hallam—men who have no prejudices in favour of the Archbishop. The Society will scarcely feel themselves justified in taking a position which that gentleman would condemn. In alluding to the Archbishop's execution, Mr. Hallam remarks with great force and truth—

"The most unjustifiable act of these zealots, and one of the greatest reproaches of the Long Parliament, was the death of Archbishop Laud. In the first days of the session, while the fall of Strafford struck every one with astonishment, the Commons had carried up an impeachment against him for high treason, in fourteen articles of charge; and he had lain ever since in the tower, his revenues and even private estate

sequestered, and in great indigence. After nearly three years' neglect, specific articles were exhibited against him in October, 1643, but not proceeded on with vigour till December, 1644; when, for whatever reason, a determination was taken to pursue this unfortunate prelate to death. Nothing could be more monstrous than the allegation of treason in this case."*

Every event, respecting which parties have ever been at issue, seems to be perverted by Dr. Vaughan, in order to inflict a portion of obloquy on the Church of England, her bishops, or the Stuart sovereigns. Thus the massacre in 1641, of which it might reasonably be supposed none but Papists would speak without horror, is softened down and almost justified.

"It had been provoked principally by the tyranny of Strafford, raging most in those quarters where his capacity had been chiefly exercised; but must also be traced to those laws against the Catholic (Papist) worship, any relaxation of which was more strongly opposed by the majority of the Protestant settlers than by the viceroy."—p. 345.

We are not aware that any such cause has been assigned for the Irish massacre by any respectable authority. Certain it is that Dr. Vaughan has cited none. In all those cases in which he makes statements never before put forth, he takes special care not to mention the authority on which he professes to ground his assertions. This is a crafty, but a very dishonest course. It is true that he cannot be charged with mistaking or perverting his authorities, but he is exposed to a still heavier charge, that of publishing on his own authority statements which are directly at variance with the truth. Mr. Hallam says—"The rebellion broke out, as is well known, by a sudden massacre of the Scots and English in Ulster, designed, no doubt, by a vindictive and bigoted people to extirpate those races."† Not one word is mentioned by Mr. Hallam respecting Strafford or the penal laws as the cause of the massacre; but Dr. Vaughan is in alliance with Papists for political objects, and he must speak softly of them and their Church. The tyranny of Strafford and the laws against *Catholic* (Roman) worship were the causes of the massacre! The poor Papists, according to this *veracious* writer, were actually goaded into the perpetration of the massacre of the oppressive Protestants. Truly Dr. Lingard himself could not set up a better defence for the Irish Papists. Both these gentlemen labour to remove the odium of the massacre from the popish religion; but Dr. Lingard's hypothesis is far more probable than Dr. Vaughan's, though the latter is a profess-

* Hallam's Const. Hist. vol. ii. 228, 229. † Hallam, iii. 520.

ing Protestant and a dissenting minister. Dr. Lingard attributes the massacre to the unconstitutional proceedings of the English Parliament.* This is far more probable than that it was caused by Strafford, and the penal laws against popery: but Dr. Vaughan will not say one word against his friends the Parliamentarians: he is too great a lover of the Parliament and too much of an enemy to the king to do that: nor dare he say one word against popery, because, at the present moment, Dissenters and Papists are linked together in one common brotherhood. He has, therefore devised a new scheme which he has sent forth under the auspices of a public society, and he expects it to be credited and received on his own unsupported authority. A little reflection would have shewn him its inconsistency. On many occasions he charges the court and the bishops with countenancing popery; but in speaking of the massacre, he insinuates that the *severity practised against the Papists* was the cause of the Irish rebellion. At one time he alleges the charge of popery against the government; at another that of severity towards the Papists by enacting laws against their worship; and in the previous extract he actually declares that the massacre was caused in part by those penal laws. He, of course, disapproves of those laws—laws, be it remembered, enacted by a government whom he frequently charges with countenancing popery; and yet the Parliamentarians, whom he admires, proceeded to enact laws more stringent than those of which he complains.

The first volume closes with the death of Charles I., who does not meet with much favour at the hands of our author. Nay, he is not willing to grant that he displayed any talent in the discussion on Church government with Henderson, the Scottish Presbyterian:—

"The disputants ended where they had begun, and victory was claimed by the partisans of each; but it is no reflection on the monarch to suppose him the inferior of a man whose days had been spent in exploring the sources of ecclesiastical learning, instead of being given to the frivolities of a court, or distracted by the cares of government and of civil war."—p. 427.

In a note he expresses his opinion that the papers which were published as the production of Charles proceeded from the pen of Clarendon. Thus he would insinuate that no credit is due to his Majesty—in short, that his arrows were taken from another man's quiver. It has been said that Henderson was

* Lingard, x. 41.

convinced by the king's arguments, and that he made a confession to that effect before his death. Into the accuracy of this report we need not inquire, as it does not in any way affect the question as to the superiority of one or other of the disputants; but the insinuation put forth in the preceding extract, that Charles was evidently inferior to his opponent, is so calculated to mislead the public that we cannot let it pass without notice. According to Dr. Vaughan, Henderson triumphed in argument over the king. That our author should favour such a notion can only be attributed to his hatred of the king, and his approval of the political measures pursued against him, since, as an Independent, he must be quite as much opposed to the line of argument adopted by Henderson as to that adopted by Charles. The arguments of both are fatal to Independency. But few persons have ever considered that Henderson obtained the victory: even those writers who favoured presbytery never asserted that the king was worsted in argument; they admit that his Majesty was equal to his opponent. Later writers, who are neither attached to episcopacy nor to presbytery, do not discover the king's inferiority as insinuated by Dr. Vaughan. One instance from Mr. Hallam may suffice to shew that our author's views on this matter are not supported by the evidence which is still preserved of the dispute. "It is more than insinuated (says Mr. Hallam) that Henderson died of mortification at his defeat. But those who take the trouble to read these papers will probably not think one party so much the stronger as to shorten the other's days."* Mr. Hallam does not attach much importance to the controversy, but he has carefully examined it, and it is clear that he does not consider that the king was inferior in argument to his opponent.

But Dr. Vaughan asserts that the papers were written by Clarendon: he labours hard to destroy the credit of the king. Mr. Hallam remarks that Charles was peculiarly qualified for such discussions; and Whitelock tells us that at the treaty in the Isle of Wight, the king's information and powers of argument relative to Episcopacy were remarked by the commissioners; and at this period he was alone, without any of his chaplains or followers to assist him. It is therefore clear that he was well versed in the controversy.

With the close of the first volume we take our leave of Dr. Vaughan and the Society until a future Number, when we purpose to give a similar exposure of the errors and misrepresen-

* Hallam, ii. 813.

tations of the second, including the period from the death of Charles I. to the revolution, a period of great importance in our history. We have already proved that Dr. Vaughan was the most unfit person to write a history for the Society; and the proof will be abundantly strengthened by our examination of his second volume.

ART. IV.—*Aristotelis Politicorum libri octo, edidit* CAROLUS GOETTLING, Prof. P.E. in Univ. Lit. Jenensi.* Jenæ. 1824.

2. *Historical Researches on the Carthaginians, &c.* By Professor HEEREN. Oxford. 1832.

3. *History of Rome.* By THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D., Head Master of Rugby School. Vol. ii. London. 1840.

ABOUT sixty years before the foundation of Rome, a band of merchant adventurers of Tyre sailed into an open bay on the northern coast of Africa, and having bargained with the native chiefs for a small portion of the soil, erected a betzura or small fort, around which rose the temporary habitations of the wanderers. For a few years, these colonists paid a small tribute to the natives on whose coast they had settled; "but in process of time they became what the Europeans have been in India—no longer dependent settlers, but sovereigns; and the native Africans, driven back from the coast, and confined to the interior, were reduced to the condition of strangers on their own soil." From these small beginnings, rose the mighty empire of Carthage. The actual territory on the main land acquired by these colonists, the Carthaginian possessions in Africa, were of no great extent: the waters of the lake Tritonis bounded them on the south; the territory of the Numidian Cirta, the modern Constantineh, hemmed them in on the west. But the political influence and indirect sway of Carthage extended from the Philænorum Aræ, the bounds of Cyrene, to the Pillars of Hercules, and far into the interior, over many a tributary native chief. Three centuries after, hundreds of gallies and hundreds of thousands of mercenaries attested the wealth and power of Carthage in the fruitful isle of Sicily; whilst Corsica, Sardinia, and Gades were her tributaries. Ere the end of the third century before Christ, Sicily and Sardinia were lost, and her possessions in Spain confined within the line of the Ebro. She had

* Excursus iii., de Republicâ Carthaginiensium.

measured weapons with Rome and bowed to her power. Again Carthage arose in her might, shook the empire of Rome to its very base, devastated her territory, massacred her armies, and all but annihilated her fleets; and then fell from her independent state, and became Rome's most powerful subject. During half a century she bore, with patience, the imperiousness of Rome and the depredations of Rome's ally, Massinissa. At last the power of endurance was overtaxed, and Carthage fell. The ruthless old man had spoken her doom.

The destruction of this great city, the first in the commercial world of that day, accomplished by cool, deliberate treachery, without provocation from its defenceless inhabitants (who had thrown themselves on the generosity of their masters), was a fine specimen of the cold-blooded policy so successfully cultivated by Rome—one more blot on her already dimmed escutcheon. Swept as was Carthage from the face of the earth, did she leave no record of her sorrows? Has no native poet, orator, philosopher, or historian, left us his record of how men thought and acted within her walls? Not one!

"There were Carthaginian writers, we know (says Dr. Arnold). Sallust had heard translations of passages in their historical records; and the Roman senate, when Carthage was destroyed, ordered Mago's book of Agriculture to be translated into Latin. Nor were geographical accounts of their voyages of discovery wanting; but of poets, orators, and philosophers, we hear nothing. It was a Greek who gave what may be called the Carthaginian account of the first Punic war; it was to two Greeks that Hannibal committed the task of recording his own immortal expedition into Italy. Thus Carthage, not having spoken of what was in her heart, it has passed, along with herself, into destruction; and we can now only know something of what she did, without understanding what she was."

What a stern lesson does this utter destruction of so rich, so powerful a state, read to the vain-glorious nations of our own day: not one stone left upon another; the relics of her language, a few lines in a Latin play;* not a remnant of her poetry, her

* We subjoin a few of the lines of Hanno's speech, that our readers may perceive a near relation of the Punic to the Hebrew—

"N'yth alonim valonuth sicorath iismason sith,
Churmlachai, iythmn; Mitsliah mittebarim ischi;
Liphoorcaneth ith beni ith yad adi ubinuthai."

Plauti Pœnulus, Act i. Scene i.

The entire relic contains about sixteen lines, many of which are dotted with semi-Latin words. This, we believe, is the only specimen of the language now extant.

philosophy, or her oratory; the whole account of her once famous constitution, a few pages of dark hints in Aristotle, eked out by a chapter in Polybius, a few confused paragraphs in Livy, or a careless sentence or so in Justin. Of all her piles and palaces, there remains not the fragment of a potsherd to take up water!

It were no difficult task, though most unsatisfactory, to repeat the wise deductions of those Roman writers who have left us their ideas of what Carthage was and what she did. But those writers saw through such deeply tinted glasses, that their every word requires a careful scrutiny: so imbued were they with the spirit of the Roman constitution, so constantly had they its forms and offices before their eyes, that, seeking for parallels where they wished to find them, every thing in their sight was Roman. The few pages of Aristotle's politics form therefore, our first and only good authority in investigating the polity of Carthage; and were we not sufficiently urged to that investigation by the desire of endeavouring to discover by what internal rules so great an empire was conducted, the approving verdict of that great master—*πολιτεύεσθαι δέ δοκοῦσι καὶ καρχηδόνιοι καλῶς* the only direct approval registered in his work of all the many constitutions reviewed therein, would in our eyes be no trifling excuse for occupying some few pages with the investigation.

On this able and judicious constitution (for were we entirely ignorant of its internal machinery, the fact of its never having suffered to any material extent from either a faction or a tyrant, up to the time of Aristotle, would warrant us in so designating it) Dr. Arnold seems to have bestowed too little time and attention, to render his account of the Carthaginian polity worthy of his History: content to follow the deductions of Heëren and Klüge, rather than to bestow on it that diligence in investigation which characterises the remainder of his valuable work.

When we consider the influence which a parent state naturally exercises over an infant colony—the admiration entertained by the majority of all classes for their ancient form of government—the utter improbability, if not impossibility, of such a mixed and complicated polity as that of Carthage having been sent out ready-made along with the original colonists—that in the natural order of events a tyranny rises out of a monarchy or a democracy—that we have the word of Aristotle that a tyranny did precede the mixed government of Carthage*—and, lastly, the improba-

* *ἀλλὰ μεταβάλλει καὶ εἰς ἀριστοκρατίαν τυραννὶς ὥσπερ ἐν Καρχηδόνι.* Pol. v. 10.

bility of a young colony submitting to a tyranny, at the very moment when the troubles and miseries of settling rendered all one great family; we may without much hazard assume, that the restricted monarchy of Tyre was continued in a slightly modified form in the infant colony of Carthage. The distance from the mother city gradually worked a change for the worse in the institutions of the colony; the power of the senate—the original curb on that of the kings—was weakened at every opportunity, and at last sunk into a mere nominal power. Then there arose the tyrant, so unbridled in his license that, ere many years had passed, the entire people had risen as one man, driven him out, and raised on the ruins of his power that constitution which for more than six centuries had not suffered in any serious degree either from faction or from a tyrant.* The great change that then took place was to a mixed government, in which aristocracy was predominant. This may seem rather paradoxical; "but (says Dr. Arnold) in such mixed governments, one element is always predominant: first, in the natural course of things, the monarchial; next, the aristocratical; and, lastly, the democratical. The predominance of one element by no means implies, however, the total inactivity of the others; and in their common, though not equal actions, consists the excellence of such constitutions." The theory is correct; the application to Carthage incorrect; for the elements in its constitution were not monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy; but aristocracy, timocracy, and democracy. Besides, in its mixed form of government, the monarchy never was predominant; but first the aristocracy, then the timocracy, or monied men; the full development of the democratic state being prevented, as Dr. Arnold observes, "by the premature destruction of the nation." The form which the government assumed was, two kings or suffetes reigning conjointly, two senates, an upper and a lower house, and a comitium. "When then, as in Carthage (says Aristotle), a polity"—*βλέπει ἔις τὸ πλοῦτον*—the senate of one hundred and four members—the lower house—*καὶ ἀρετὴν*—the kings and the upper senate—*καὶ δῆμον*—the comitia—*ἄυτη ἀριστοκρατικὴ ἐστιν.* Such are the three great divisions into which Aristotle has separated this "*πολιτέια μεμιγμένη.*" When, however, we come to analyse the component parts, and carefully to investigate the nature and

* *Καὶ μήτε στάσιν ὅτι καὶ ἄξιον εἰπεῖν μήτε τύραννον.*—Pol. xi. 8. There had been only one attempt at a revolution before Aristotle wrote, namely by Hanno, B. C. 340: one other took place after his death—that by Bomilcar, about B. C. 306.

bearing of each office, their qualifications and their powers, we shall see how all the elements merge into one another, and in what varying proportions they may be traced through every part of the constitution. Although we are not inclined to bestow unlimited praise on this polity, and, as some have done, to rank it above all modern forms of government, we cannot join with Dr. Arnold in his sweeping censure, "that it was in the spirit of that worst form of aristocracy, which the Greeks called Oligarchy." Bad as it was, it was yet far from oligarchical; and if we may judge from its effects, it was admirably well adapted to the people.

To commence, then, from those officers in their government whom the Carthaginians denominated "suffetes" or judges, but whom Aristotle, Polybius, and Justin have called "kings." Although it is nowhere distinctly asserted, what was the number of these high rulers, it is by no means difficult to prove that they were but two, and that their rule was conjoined and simultaneous, like that of the kings of Sparta or the consuls of Rome. Aristotle, having spoken of the great similarity that existed between the polities of Sparta and Carthage, in the sussitia of the political clubs, to the sussitia of Sparta; and in the power of the senate of the hundred and four to the ephoralty; making only one exception, that the election of the ephors was mere chance—*'εκ τῶν τυχόντων*—but that of the senate according to worth—*'αριστίνδην*—concludes his remarks on the parallelism by the assertion, that the institution of the Carthaginian kings differed not from that of the kings of Sparta, save in the qualification and the mode of election; thus admitting their exact agreement in number and power. Livy's comparison between their power and that of the consuls, is another argument in favour of their number being two, and their power simultaneous and conjoined.* But did not the theory of the alterations of the Carthaginian tyranny absolutely restrict their number to two? When the Carthaginians subverted their tyrant, it was their wish neither to return to their original form of polity, lest another tyrant should arise, nor entirely to subvert it. Retaining,

---

* *'Εχει δὲ παραπλήσια τῇ Λακωνικῇ πολιτείᾳ τὰ μὲν συσσίτια τῶν ἑταιριῶν τοῖς συσσιτίοις, τὴν δὲ των ἑκατὸν καὶ τετάρων ἀρχὴν τοῖς ἐφόροις, πλὴν οὐ χεῖρον οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν τυχόντων εἰσί, τάυτην δὲ αἱροῦνται τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀριστίνδην. Τοὺς δὲ βασιλεῖς καὶ τὴν γερουσίαν ἀνάλογον τοῖς 'εκεῖ βασιλεῦσι, καὶ γέρουσι· καὶ βέλτιον (δὲ) τοὺς βασιλεῖς, μήτε κατὰ τὸ ἀυτὸ εἶναι γένος, μηδε τοῦτο τὸ τυχόν, ἀλλ' ἔι τι διαφέρον, ἐκ τούτων αἱρετοὺς ἢ καθ' ἡλικίαν.*—Pol. ii. 8.

Senatum itaque Suffetes (quod velut consulare imperium apud eos erat) vocaverunt.—Liv. xxx. 7.

therefore, or perhaps restoring, their one king and their one senate, they added another king and another senate as a counterbalance. Besides creating a new king, they altered the qualification for that newly-created office; for, thinking it but right that in a city whose merchants were kings, her kings should be of the merchant class, that they should be chosen—*οὐ μόνον ἀριστίνδην*—by descent and ability—*ἀλλὰ καὶ πλουτίνδην*—but for their wealth; they left the one king to be chosen from among the aristocracy of birth, adding to him another king, the representative of the aristocracy of wealth. Birth, ability, and wealth, were the elements of their constitution; in all their appointments they had regard to them, and chiefly in the selection of their most important officers—their suffetes and generals.* The qualification of the kings being different, their duties differed in a similar manner; for although they ruled and acted at the same time, yet they took separate departments—the one superintending the internal, the other the external affairs of the State. We know not what was the required age, but if we can credit Nepos, Hannibal was created suffes at the age of twenty-two, though we are inclined to believe that for "Rex" we ought to read "Dux"—a reading much more agreeable to the theory of the constitution, and to the recorded fact of Hannibal's election, at that age, to the post of general. With regard to the duration of the kingly office, we consider the account given by Nepos, of their being elected annually, utterly unworthy of credit. First, because we consider that Livy's expression, "quod velut consulare imperium apud eos erat," misled that careless writer; secondly, because such an idea is inconsistent with the expression of Polybius, "Hanno the Son of King Bomilcar;" thirdly, because it militates against the passage in Cicero's Republic, where he compares the suffetes to the early kings of Rome, and contrasts them with the consular power;† and lastly, because it would entirely destroy the parallel drawn by Aristotle between the Kings of Carthage and Sparta; we agreeing with the dictum of Goetling, that—"Unus Aristoteles mille Nepotum instar est."

---

* *Οὐ μόνον ἀριστίνδην, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλουτίνδην οἴονται δεῖν αἱρεῖσθαι τοὺς ἄρχοντας· ἀδύνατον γὰρ τὸν ἀποροῦντα καλῶς ἄρχειν καὶ σχολάζειν ..... αἱροῦνται γὰρ εἰς δύο ταῦτα (ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλουτίνδην) βλέποντες καὶ μάλιστα τὰς μεγίστας, τούς τε βασιλεῖς καὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς.*—Pol. ii. 8. From a comparison of passages, we conclude that the word *Ἀριστινδην* means, general worth based on descent.

† Cicero de Republica. lib. ii. cap. 23.

Judicial power was vested in the suffetes—certainly in that one who acted as president of the hundred and four, if not in both.

The senates next engage our attention—a vexata questio in this enquiry. As we shall have to find fault with Dr. Arnold, it will be but fair that we should quote his account before we proceed to give our own. The learned Doctor, following Justin, Polybius, and Heeren, rather than Aristotle, says thus:—

"The great council was probably an assembly as numerous as the Roman senate, and, like the senate, was a mixed body, containing members of different ages, who, in whatever manner appointed, were a sort of representation of the general feelings of the aristocracy. But from this great council there were chosen one hundred members, who formed what was called the Council of Elders, and who, in fact, were the supreme authority in the state. They were originally appointed as a check upon the power of the captains-general, and were a court before which every general, on his return from foreign command, had to render an account of his conduct. But by degrees they became not only criminal judges in all cases, but also a supreme executive council, of which the two suffetes or kings were the presidents. In this capacity they were legally, we may presume, no more than a managing committee for the great council; but as they were themselves members of that council, so they became in ordinary cases its substitute, and in all cases exercised such a controul over it, that they are called a power for governing the general council itself."*

Our first objection to this very easy and pleasant sketch is the confusion made between the gerusia or older senate, the synclete or new senate, and the council of the hundred and four, selected from the latter senate.

Secondly, the council did not consist of only one hundred members, as is carelessly asserted by Justin, but of one hundred and four members though it was generally called the council of the hundred, according to many similar misnomers in ancient and modern times; and consequently that council which is called the hundred and that which is said to have consisted of one hundred and four members are not to be considered as two councils, but as one and the same. The gerusia or elder senate, according to Aristotle,† was in all respects (for it should be remarked that he makes no exception in his parallel as to the gerusia) similar to the gerusia in Sparta; a superior senate, elected according to descent, presided over by the ὁ κατ' ἐξοχὴν βασιλεὺς, the suffete who represented the ancient king, elected

* Arnold. p. 540.

† Τοὺς δὲ βασιλεῖς καὶ τὴν γερουσίαν ἀνάλογον τοῖς ἐκεῖ βασιλεῦσι καὶ γέρουσι.—Pol. ii. 8.

from their own ranks.* Carrying out the parallel, we may fairly conclude that their numbers were similar to those of Sparta—that thirty senators sat at the council-table. And this conclusion we do not fear to come to, in the face of Polybius's account, that thirty of the gerusia—*τριάκοντα τῆς Γερουσίας*—assisted in reconciling Hanno and Hamilcar, having little faith in the accuracy of that historian's political information.† The power of the gerusia was supreme in deciding for war or peace, in the ordering and raising of the naval and military forces, and in the appointment of the commanders.‡ It seems probable, that at this point their power over the commanders ceased, as the council of the hundred and four took cognizance of the conduct of every officer; and they alone passed sentence upon him on his return from service.

There can be little, if any, doubt of the existence of the synclete or new senate, or that it originally, under the presidency of the other suffete, had the supreme jurisdiction over public and private causes. We are certain that it was more numerous than the gerusia, as it admitted of a selection of more than one hundred members from its body, without destroying its outward form, however, it may have abrogated its actual power. We need not fear to assume its chief qualification to have been wealth, and to regard it as the representative of the property of the nation. More than this we cannot determine, as well from the meagreness of Aristotle's sketch, as from the inaccuracy and confusion of those afforded us by Polybius, Livy, and Justin. Much as we may regret our inability to satisfy a laudable curiosity on this point, we may console ourselves with the idea that we do know a little more of that selection from this body,

---

* *ὁ δὲ πρεσβύτατος ἀυτῶν* (the Roman Ambassadors) *δείξας ἔν τῷ συνεδρίῳ* (Polybius's term for the gerusia) *τὸν κόλπον· ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἀυτοῖς, ἔφη, καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην φέρειν.—Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς των Καρχηδονίων, ὁπότερον ἀυτοῖς φαίνοιτο, τοῦτ' ἐκβαλεῖν ἐκέλευσε.*—Pol. iii. 33.

† De numero senatorum nihil traditum ab antiquis scriptoribus est; sed ex comparatione cum Lacedæmoniorum senatu, quæ est apud Aristotelem et Polybium, non inepte augurere triginta fuisse senatores. Quod etiam Polybii loco confirmatur qui (i. 87,) triginta senatores in concordiam reduxisse Hannomem et Hamilcarem tradit. Quod ibi *τριακοντα τῆς γερουσιας προχειρισάμενοι* dicitur id pro more Polybii factum est, qui in rebus politicis non perspicacissimum, se præbet.—Goetling, p. 485.

‡ See the last quotation but one.—Polyb. iii. 33.

the council of the hundred and four, which gradually assumed the entire power, executive as well as judicial, previously committed to the more numerous body.

From this larger assembly, whatever were its numbers, a selection was annually made by certain boards of five, called pentarchies, hereafter to be commented upon more at length, of one hundred and four individuals prominent for their wealth and their ability, and called by Aristotle,* *τὴν τῶν ἑκατὸν καὶ τεττάρων ἀρχὴν—ἄρχεια—ἀρχαὶ*, and by Livy, Judices. They were at first elected annually, and continued thus until about the time of Hannibal, when their reign, for it was little less than a reign, had extended itself to two years; whilst, from the pentarchies continually re-electing them, they continued so long in office as to merit the term bestowed on them by the Roman historian, of "perpetual."† From their similarity to the Spartan ephors, in every thing save the qualification and mode of election,‡ we may well believe that they, ere long, arrogated to themselves the entire power in the state, bending kings and senators to their will, and carefully preventing any appeal to the people, by enforcing unanimity among the officials. Hannibal attempted to break this power by restoring the ancient mode of annual elections; but unless he also forbade re-election, or in some other way effectually controlled the pentarchies, he left their actual power as extensive as ever. The jurisdiction of these judges was universal—not divided into equity courts, common law, and other minor distinctions; but one and all exercising a similar jurisdiction over every kind of cause: this, according to our great authority, was a peculiarly aristocratical trait in their polity.‡

We have spoken of the pentarchies: let us now proceed to solve the riddle of their nature; this "vexatissima questio" of our enquiry, the exercise-ground of every commentator, this "locus perdifficilis" of every German critic. We have given

---

* *τὴν δὲ τῶν ἑκατὸν καὶ τεττάρων ἀρχὴν τοῖς ἐφόροις, (παραπλήσιον) πλὴν ὀυ χεῖρον· οἱ μὲρ γὰρ ἐκ τῶν τυχόντων εἰσί, ταύτην δὲ αἱροῦνται τήν ἀρχὴν ἀριστίνδην.*—Pol. ii. 8.

† Judicum ordo Karthagine ea tempestate dominabatur; eo maxime, quod iidem perpetui judices erant. .. .. Hannibal ..... legem extemplo promulgavit pertulitque ut in singulos annos judices legerentur, nequis biennium continuum judex esset.—Livy xxxiii. 46.

‡ *Τὸ δ' ἀμισθους καὶ μὴ κληρωτὰς, ἀριστοκρατικὸν θετέον, καὶ ἔι τι τοιοῦτον ἕτερον· καὶ τὸ τὰς δίκας ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχείων δικάζεσθαι πάσας, καὶ μὴ ἄλλας ὑπ' ἄλλων.*—Pol. ii. 8.

the passage in the note ;* let us now read the version of it given by Heeren in his Appendix—

"But the pentarchies, who many and great affairs have to transact, choose one another, and also the council of the hundred, who form the highest magistracy. They also continue longer in office than any others (for it commences before they enter into that office, and continues after they leave it), and in this the government is oligarchic."

Such is the professor's translation of this passage, on whose authority Dr. Arnold has stated—

"That these commissions had great and various powers, and that their members remained longer in office than the ordinary magistrates, inasmuch as they exercised an authority both before and after their regular term of magistracy."—ii. 550.

With these dicta we disagree: but before our points of disagreement are discussed, let us state our points of agreement. We admit, that these so called pentarchies were close, self-elected commissioners of five, the electors of a certain body, called "the hundred," commissioners for executing, under the direction of the council, the offices of the government. The treasury, the navy, the army, the police, the censorship, were put into commissions of five. As to the numbers of these commissioners, with the learned doctor we do not attempt even to guess at them; however such has not been the prudence of certain German critics, who have determined them to be ten, divided into two commissions; according to Goetling, five were censors, five questors, all which information may be believed by those who consider that Aristotle's allusion to the twofold qualification *ἀριστίνδην* and *πλουτίνδην* warrants such a conclusion. Another critic, by altering the word "*μέλλοντες*" into "*μένοντες*," has persuaded himself, at least, that one commission was provincial, the other metropolitan. So much for this ingenuity of German critics, only to be paralleled with that of our former friend Süvern, who, by a system of critico-comparative anatomy, has elicited the entire plot of the "old men" of Aristophanes from the dozen lines capable of being brought together from various sources.

We need not here repeat our reasons for considering the "hundred" to be the same as the "hundred and four," our

---

* *Τὸ δὲ τὰς πενταρχίας κυρίας οὔσας παλλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ὑφ ἄυτῶν αἱρετὰς εἶναι, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἑκατὸν ταύτας αἱρεῖσθαι τὴν μεγίστην ἀρχήν, ἔτι δὲ ταύτας πλείονα ἄρχειν χρόνον τῶν ἄλλων (καὶ γὰρ ἐξεληλυθότες ἄρχουσι καὶ μέλλοντες) ὀλιγαρχικὸν.*—Pol. ii. 8.

first point of disagreement with Drs. Heeren and Arnold; but will pass on to the main point of difference, the duration of the authority of these commissions—the interpretation of the parenthesis "*καὶ γὰρ ἐξεληλυθότες ἄρχουσι καὶ μέλλοντες.*" There can be no doubt, but that *ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τῶν ἀρχείων* is to be taken in the sense of the Latin phrase "abire magistratu," proving that their power did not cease with their office: the most natural interpretation, and the one most generally received among critics, is, that on their ceasing to be of the pentarchy, they ascended, through the power of their colleagues, to the council of the hundred; the seat in any of the pentarchies naturally leading to the higher and more influential post. It remains, then, to interpret the two last words of the sentence "*καὶ μέλλοντες*;" rejecting all intention of substituting any other word for "*μέλλοντες.*" We cannot see how the infinitive to *μέλλοντες* can be drawn from any other source than from the participle *ἐξεληλυθότες*, and consequently feel bound to reject such additions, as "*εἰσιέναι* or "*βαδίζειν εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν,*" or *ἄρχειν*; and to accept in their stead the very natural conclusion to the sentence, of "*ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τῶν πενταρχιῶν*"—at the very moment when they are departing from the pentarchies. What we deduce from the entire passage is, that immediately on the expiration of their pentarchate, their power was continued by their promotion to the council, and yet, at the very time of their departure, they exercised one of the greatest powers vested in them as members of the pentarchy, by re-electing their successors. We thus avoid the metropolitan and provincial fiction, and the confusion of giving to them a pentarchal power, previous to their election to that office.

As long as the gerusia and the suffetes agreed, which it was their policy to do as far as lay in their power, there seems to have been little or no appeal to the comitia—the great body of free citizens of Carthage. They might now and then have their approval asked of some treaty, or the appointment of a general, where it was previously certain that it would be granted, and the constitution had rendered such an appeal merely formal. When, however, the suffetes and the gerusia could not set their horses together, the power of the *Δημος* was considerable. Not only could they pass an affirmative or negative vote on the proposition submitted to them, but they might canvass every part and parcel of the matter, and cut and carve according to their own views. Until the time when the powerful party of Hamilcar gathered to itself the strength of the people, and divided the aristocracy, we may be well assured that the suffetes and the

gerusia were wonderfully harmonious, and that the appeal to the Δημος was singularly unfrequent.*

The syssitia of the Carthaginians,† "*συσσίτια τῶν ἑταιριῶν,*" were perhaps similar to those of Sparta, in the point of all who were present sharing equally the general fund; but here the parallel ceases; the object of the one being discipline, that of the other political power. They approached much nearer to our political club dinners; our buff and blue banquets; or the modern Carltons, Brookes, and Reform clubs. They must not, however, be confounded with the state dinners now and then given by a successful general or popular magistrate. For they were entirely in the hands of the aristocracy, "their clubs, where they habitually met at a common mess or public table, with the very object of binding them more closely to each other, and imbuing them entirely with the spirit of their order."—*Arnold*, ii. 551.

Such may we be allowed to suppose was the mixed constitution of Carthage, on which we leave our readers to form their own opinions.

Before we conclude our paper, let us pause on one fact highly interesting to a commercial people such as ourselves—the non-metallic currency of the Carthaginians—their system of government paper. The invention of a non-metallic circulating medium has been ascribed by Washington Irving to one of the knights of Spain, during the Moorish war, towards the close of the fifteenth century.

"Fray Antonio Agapida relates, that it happened that the Count de Tendilla was destitute of gold and silver wherewith to pay the wages of his troops, and the soldiers murmured greatly, seeing that they had not the means of purchasing necessaries from the people of the town. In this dilemma, what does this sagacious commander? He takes him a number of little morsels of paper, on which he inscribes various sums, large and small, according to the nature of the case, and signs them with his own hand and name: these did he give to the soldiery in earnest of their pay. How, you will say, are soldiers to be paid with scraps of paper? Even so, I answer, and well paid too, as I will pre-

---

* Τοῦ μὲν γὰρ τὸ μὲν προσάγειν, τὸ δὲ μὴ προσάγειν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον οἱ βασιλεῖς κύριοι μετὰ τῶν γερόντων, ἂν ὁμογνωμῶσι πάντες· εἰ δὲ μή, καὶ τούτων ὁ δῆμος. Ἃ δ'ἂν εἰσφέρωσιν οὗτοι, οὐ διακοῦσαι μόνον ἀποδιδόασι τῷ δήμῳ τὰ δόξαντα τοῖς ἀρχουσιν, ἀλλα κύριοι κρίνειν εἰσὶ· καὶ τῷ βουλομενῳ τοῖς ἐπιφερομένοις ἀντειπεῖν ἔξεστιν. —Pol. ii. 8.

† Ἔχει δὲ παραπλήσια τῇ Λακωνικῇ πολιτείᾳ, τὰ μὲν συσσίτια τῶν ἑταιριων.—Pol. ii. 8.

sently make manifest; for the good Count issued a proclamation ordering the inhabitants of Alhama (where he was besieged) to take these morsels of paper for the full amount thereon inscribed, promising to redeem them at a future time with silver and gold, and threatening severe punishments to all who should refuse. Thus, by a most subtle alchymy, did this Catholic cavalier turn worthless paper into precious gold."—*Conquest of Grenada*, i. 242.

"Kublai Khan (says Marco Polo, in Sir Francis Palsgrave's most interesting 'Truths and Fictions'), with more than chemical skill, can turn paper into gold at his sovereign will and pleasure. Throughout his vast dominions the currency consists almost wholly of paper money. The paper used in Cathay is made from the bark of the mulberry tree. This paper is cut into pieces of a convenient size: each piece is in the shape of a parallelogram—rectangular, but longer than it is wide; and thereupon, by means of small slabs of wood, properly carved and covered with a pigment, they print certain lines and characters, each of which express a word. The coinage, if I may so call the process by which the paper money acquires its value, is performed with much precaution and ceremony. Certain officers, appointed for that purpose, subscribe their names and affix their signets; and lastly, the principal, who is especially deputed by the Khan, adds a stamp expressing his name and titles, and which, dipped in vermilion, leaves its mark. This process authenticates the document and it passes throughout the whole empire."

This carries back the invention to the middle of the thirteenth century. The claim which we now put in for the Carthaginians, carries it back to the time when the dialogues which are known as those of Æschines the philosopher were written. Whether or not that was as far back as the age of the follower of Socrates as was once believed, but of course is now disbelieved (after the approved mode of modern criticism), still the language of these dialogues proves them to belong to an age when Greek was still written with great purity—rather before the times of Kublai Khan—

"The Carthaginians (says the author of the dialogue) make use of the following kind of money. In a small piece of leather, a substance is wrapped of the size of a piece of four drachmæ, but what this is no one knows but the maker. This is sealed and circulated, and he who possesses the most of these is considered the richest man."*

From this it is evident, that at some time or other of their

* Αὐτικα γὰρ ὄντοι Καρχηδόνιοι νομίσματι χρῶνται τοιῳδε, ἐν δερματίῳ μικρῷ ἀποδέδεται ὁσόν τε στατῆρος τὸ μέγεθος μάλιστα· ὃ τι δὲ ἔστι τὸ ἀποδεδεμένον ἀδεὶς γινώσκει ἐι μὴ ὁι ποιοῦντες ἔιτα κατεσφραγισμένῳ τυτῳ, νομιζουσι. Καὶ ὁ πλεῖστα τοιαῦτα κεκτημένος, οὗτος πλεῖστα δοκεῖ χρήματα κεκτῆσθαι καὶ πλουσιώτατος εἶναι.—Æschinis Dial. ii.

existence as a people, the Carthaginians had a regular government-note circulation of little real value, as far as the metal enclosed, and the leathern envelope were concerned; but of considerable value as paper money. Poor nineteenth century! One by one it loses its borrowed plumes. The Egyptians claim its wigs, and the Jews seize upon its banks; the Carthaginians appropriate its paper money; its overland mail belongs to the Ptolemies; and as to its Photogenic drawings and Daguerrotypes, "ad huc sub judice lis est;" whilst the last new discovery of its wise men of the north, that steam will extinguish fire, might be justly claimed by every little boy who has put out a match with the steam of the kettle, since the very invention of those useful utensils. Stripped by such ruthless hands, it will soon have nothing left but its vanity.

One novelty, alas! may be claimed by the Scotch, those strict observers of all religious matters; viz., that philosophical desecration of the house of God, which was reserved for the members of the British Association at Glasgow—the conversion of the Presbyterian Church into a lecture-room. We quote from the *Athenæum* of Sept. 26—

"Friday—It having been announced that Dr. Chalmers would on this day read a paper on 'The Application of Statistics to Moral and Economic Science,' the lecture-room was filled long before the time appointed for the assembling of the members, and such a crowd collected before the door that it was impossible for the chairman and committee to obtain an entrance. *Under these circumstances the meeting was adjourned to the church adjoining the college, which in a few minutes was nearly filled. Lord Sandon took the chair in what is usually called the precentor's desk, and Dr. Chalmers then partly read and partly delivered an address, which lasted for two hours, replete with eloquence and ability.*"

Can the rev. doctor, after such an exhibition, venture to claim for the Church any more sacred name than that of conventicle?

It was not the increasing preponderance of the Roman power, the confining of authority in the state to none but the rich through heavy entrance fees and expences during service, or the accumulation of many offices in one person, that contributed to the fall of Carthage, so much as the fallacious principles on which her extended commerce was conducted—principles that forced her to depend on gold and mercenaries rather than on her own hand and arm.

The principle of their commerce was the accumulation of the precious metals—the ruin of Venice and of Spain. When Carthage was a young state, the agricultural produce of her own territory was sufficient for the support of her inhabitants, and

therefore they took little from the native African but his gold-dust in exchange for the most paltry manufactures. As her population increased beyond the possibility of subsisting on their own corn, they seized upon Sardinia and Sicily as their corn-fields, bartering such of their manufactures as were suited to the people, and completing their purchases with African gold. The supply of corn and the demand for manufactures increased in very unequal proportions, as in those days luxuries were not so much in demand as necessaries; and consequently every year's commerce required a greater supply of the precious metals. The profits increased greatly, and naturally drew every one into trade. Then was the defence of Carthage left to mercenaries. Previous to the conquest of Spain, the supply of the precious metals, great as it was, was not sufficient to admit of great accumulation, or to check industry; its only effect had been to make Carthage one large manufactory. But when, by the conquest of that country, she became the mistress of its mines, and obtained untold gold in exchange for the most trifling articles of barter, and latterly by force, the influx of an immense supply of that metal worked steadily to her ruin; as the mines of Peru did to that of Spain; and the gold-accumulating trade between the East and the West did to that of Venice. With the increase of gold came that of mercenaries, and the decrease of all industry, particularly agricultural. Half Africa and Europe were in their pay, until their mines failed them, or were transferred to another power. The people had no excellence in arms or tactics; in all their numerous host, the native Carthaginians never appear but as generals or officers. Depending entirely on their navy for the defence of their country's shores, they were as deficient in fortresses as in native soldiers, and consequently, when their continental conquests in Spain rendered armies more necessary than fleets, and the people, from the superabundance of money, were more willing to subsidize Africans, Numidians, Gauls, and Spaniards, than to serve in their own persons, their navy declined, their country became defenceless, and in a few years every thing beyond the walls of the city fell before an invader. "Thus (says Dr. Arnold), with abler leaders and a richer treasury, but with a weaker people, an unguarded country, with subjects far less united and attached to her government, Carthage was really unequal to the contest with Rome;" for Rome, indeed, depended on itself and its sword—Carthage on its gold and its mercenaries.

ART. V.—*Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon.* By a Member of the Families of Shirley and Hastings. Two volumes. Fifth Thousand. London: Painter. 1841.

FRUITFUL as these volumes have been to our own minds in subjects of gladdening or melancholy meditation, and various as were the feelings of sympathy, of admiration, and of disapproval, with which we turned over their ample pages, we had not intended to offer any public expression of opinion respecting their merits or their defects. Recent circumstances have altered our determination; and we open these records of religious exertion once more, with a view of presenting a few reflections upon their temper and objects to our readers. And, indeed, the book itself carries a powerful appeal to the diligent and considerate examination of all who peruse it. Its composition has evidently been a labour of love, as well as of years. Perfectly unacquainted with the writer, and ignorant alike of his character and situation, save that he declares himself "a member of the families of Shirley and Hastings," we have been struck by the earnestness of his zeal, the apparent sincerity of his religious impressions, and the hearty confidence with which he throws himself into the stream of his narrative. He believes what he says, and is in earnest about it. This is a great thing; it gives a principle of life to his volumes, and animates the reader, even when fatigued and disappointed.

Nor should we pass over unnoticed the glimpses of eminent men in the world of literature and politics that frequently at once attract our attention and reward it. These portraits, or rather outlines, are often sketched with the vivacity and truthfulness of a religious Boswell: but the value of the work is to be sought for in the religious information it unfolds to us.

The Life of Lady Huntingdon forms an episode in the history of Christianity; but it is a chapter neither to be written nor annotated upon within the limits of a review. The torch of the Reformation had long been burning with a faint and dying flame: even the foot-prints of the giants who lived under the first James and his son had been washed away by the flood that came in from France with the return of the second Charles. In succeeding reigns the corruption deepened, and "casuistry (in the words of Pope) began to walk in lawn." The literary temper that distinguished England in the time of Anne was scarcely less fatal to the advancement or awaking of true religion than the open license of Charles; it begat a polished indifference—it transferred religion among the arts and sciences, and made the teaching of the Word of God an element of the belles lettres.

If Hall, or Taylor, or Hammond, could have revisited the world which they had blessed with their presence, they would scarcely have recognized the Church they had left behind them. We read in the fictions of the East of palaces, the work of enchantment, being removed by a sudden and supernatural impulse into a distant region of the world; where, instead of fragrant gardens and silver fountains, are beheld only the solitary waste and the withered herbage of the desert; the beauty of the structure departs—its domes of pearl are changed into stone, and the architecture erected by the hand of genii crumbles into ruin. The alteration in the temple of Christian truth in England was still more wonderful; her resplendent shrines, so rich in the jewels of Scripture promise, had grown dim through neglect; her gates, so long called "Beautiful," had lost their lustre; her battlements were trodden by drowsy watchmen. The very climate in which she stood seemed to have undergone a change, and was now cold, dreary, and disconsolate.

And the night was long, though joy came to her in the morning. Descending to a later period, the same symptoms of national irreligion force themselves on the eye. Among the lower orders, a vulgar ignorance—among the higher, a graceful negligence, were the prevailing characters; Scepticism wore a calm and hateful smile; Socinianism, hideous and malign in aspect, defiled the very altars of God; and Heresy, under all the insidious forms of serpent cunning, reared her crest into the air, and threatened to "poison the morality of the land." Folly and Impudence stifled the voice of Wisdom where it might still have been heard, and—

> "Henley broke the benches with his strain,
> While Sherlock, Hare, and Gibson preach'd in vain."

The atmosphere of religious feeling was loaded with vapour, and only a few sickly rays of light struggled through the darkness. The clergy, viewed as a *body*, continued to be deficient in energy, and in the adaptation of their doctrine and lessons to the necessities of their hearers. Cowper, with much bitterness, but much truth, alludes to the degraded temper of his own age in a well-known passage in "The Task"—

> "Profusion is the sire—
> Profusion unrestrained, with all that's base
> In character, has littered all the land,
> And bred, within the memory of no few,
> A priesthood such as Baal's was of old,
> A people such as never was till now."

The exertions of a few learned and devoted men could not arrest the tide of irreligion and unbelief, or carry the ark through the dry formalism that not only impeded its motion, but threatened to annihilate it altogether. Education, in its universal application to the scattered families of the land, was not only unknown, but despised; children grew up at the knees of Ignorance, and the apostrophe to the—

"Dauntless infant! never scared with God!"

need not have been confined to "The Dunciad."

At this crisis rose Methodism. Strictly speaking, the first impulse to that sect was not given by Wesley, but by a young fellow-student at Oxford (Mr. Morgan, of Christ Church), who died before the energy and enthusiasm of his friend had given his name to a society. Wesley's account of the circumstance is sufficiently clear and interesting—

"In November, 1729 (he wrote to Mr. Morgan's father), at which time I came to reside at Oxford, your son, my brother and myself, and one more, agreed to spend three or four evenings in the week together. Our design was to read over the classics, which we had before read in private, on common nights, and on Sunday some book in divinity. In the summer following Mr. M. told me he had called at the gaol to see a man who was condemned for killing his wife, and that from the talk he had with one of the debtors, he verily believed it would do much good if any one would be at the pains of now and then speaking with them. This he so frequently repeated, that on the 24th of August, 1730, my brother and I walked with him to the castle. We were so well satisfied with our conversation there, that we agreed to go thither once or twice a-week, which we had not done long before he desired me to go with him to see a poor woman in the town who was sick. In this employment, too, when we came to reflect upon it, we believed it would be worth while to spend an hour or two in a week, provided the minister of the parish in which any such person was were not wholly against it."

Such was the beginning of Methodism. Originating, as the learned Bishop Coplestone remarks in one of his discourses, in a gentle stream of benevolence and good-will towards men, it gradually deepened in volume and widened in surface, as other springs of Christian exertion communicated with it, until at last it swept into sight a rapid and mighty river. Under these circumstances, it should have been met "with a definite theology, with an analysis of its errors—(we use the words of a contemporary)—and a discrimination between what it contained of truth and what of falsehood." No exertion of this kind was made; its adversaries did nothing but abuse it. The great body

of clergymen remained tranquil and undisturbed; until, like the shepherd in Virgil, they heard the torrent descend from the hills and saw it hurry the flock from their pasture.

It is not surprising that the early efforts of the Methodists should have been received with scorn; and this sentiment was deepened by that tendency to exaggeration which is, perhaps, inseparable from every attempt to revolutionize the public mind. Their great object being immediate *impression*, the promulgators of a new creed are often urged to overstate their case. And this is one of the dangers arising out of their position; thus upon injudicious lips, burning with unchastened enthusiasm and stimulated by the desires of a warm and excited heart, the great postulates of religion are often involved in intricate opposition. Faith stifles works, and the prescience of God annihilates the free-will offering of men. These errors are the necessary offspring of that kind of preaching which can alone be addressed to an unlettered and promiscuous assembly. The beautiful harmony of parts, irresistible induction of evidence, the grave and solemn concentration of argument upon the doctrine under examination —can only be employed in peculiar circumstances and before particular hearers. The analytical investigation of truth requires intellectual powers which are possessed by few. That investigation, however, occupied the attention and employed the talents of the most eminent prelates of our Church in the eighteenth century. The temple could not be forsaken by its divine Founder which had a Butler to protect its shrine; but that illustrious man wrote chiefly for the educated classes of the community. Admirable as are many of his sermons, to the common eye they would present features both cold and repulsive. Tillotson, again, who was the model of sacred rhetoric in those days, however excellent, or scriptural, or lucid, his discourses might be, offered a style and a system essentially ill-suited to affect the minds of the multitude.

We would not, indeed, behold within the hallowed walls of our churches the staring eye or the convulsed lip of pagan inspiration, but we would gladly see

"——— non vultus, non color unus."

The preacher should rise with his subject into a prouder dignity, and the ambassador of Christ should deliver his message with majesty and power. In this sense we may desire every minister of the Word—

"Majorque videri,
Nec mortale sonans———"

Paley, almost always judicious and temperate, in his excellent remarks upon the negative character of our Lord's discourses, particularly refers to their complete freedom from any *elation* or *emotion* of spirits—

"I feel (he continues) a respect for Methodists, because I believe that there is to be found among them much sincere piety, and availing, though not always well-informed Christianity; yet I never attended a meeting of theirs but I came away with the idea that how different what I heard was from what I read. I do not mean in doctrine (with which, at present, I have no concern), but in manner; how different from the calmness, the sobriety, the good sense, and, I may add, the strength and authority of our Lord's discourses."

In this instance, Paley's wonted sagacity seems to have forsaken him. Had he forgotten his own admirable argument with reference to the teaching of Jesus Christ? his own clear declaration that the lessons of our Lord did not consist of any thing like moral essays or like sermons? that the method he adopted was neither natural, nor would have been proper, for a moralist or a philosopher, but that it harmonised exactly with the situation of the Divine Teacher? "He produced himself as a messenger from God." The sanctity and the wonderfulness of his character superseded argument. Faith was to produce conviction; and that portrait of Christian life which he drew was illuminated by the sacred light of wonders and of miracles. The same reasoning may be transferred, with some alterations and limitations, to his apostles. The power of God was with them, and that power so decisive and so glorious in its manifestation, that the laws of the universe submitted to it—even Death acknowledged it, and the tempest of the sea stood in awe of it. Like their omnipotent Master, they put *the truth of what they taught upon authority.* They appealed both to the eyes and to the ears of those who heard them; every village around Jerusalem testified to their veracity. They could point to that holy road to Emmaus where their hearts began to burn within them. And in these preachers of the gospel do we find no elation, no emotion of spirits? Let St. Paul answer; let the trembling Felix be asked the question. They spoke of a truth with a tongue of fire; they bore down every opposing passion with the sword of the Spirit; they lighted up every declaration, not only by the rays of prophecy, but by appeals to experience. But we do not discover that the great apostle to the Gentiles availed himself more sparingly of the weapons of intellect, or of the ardour of his sanctified enthusiasm, because he possessed means of conviction which we have not, or because he had proofs to confirm his assertions which are denied to us.

Methodism, as is generally seen in similar cases, by avoiding one extreme, ran into another. The impetus it had received carried it beyond the goal—

"Enthusiasts (was the saying of the mystical, but learned and eloquent Henry More) find it an easy thing to heat the fancies of unlearned and unreflecting hearers; but when a sober man would be satisfied of the *grounds* from whence they speak, he shall not have one syllable or the least tittle of a pertinent answer. Only they will talk big of the Spirit, and inveigh against reason with bitter reproaches, calling it carnal or fleshly, though it be, indeed, no soft flesh, but enduring and penetrant steel, even the sword of the Spirit, and such as pierces to the heart."

It was so with the itinerating Methodists; they addressed themselves almost entirely to the passions; for though they might show from the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ, yet to many, indeed to the larger number of their field congregations, the Bible was a sealed book. It might have been untranslated for any thing they knew of its contents; but, in truth, some of the missionaries could not read the Bible themselves without difficulty.

Although Methodism was not resisted and confuted as it ought to have been, and as it might have been, some champions went out with slings to arrest its progress: of these, Lavington, Bishop of Exeter, is now chiefly remembered. Warburton mentions him with very moderate commendation:—"The Bishop of Exeter's book against the Methodists is, I think, on the whole, composed well enough (though it be a bad copy of Stillingfleet's famous book of the 'Fanaticism of the Church of Rome,') to do the execution he intended." Warburton himself entered the field against them, but with very small success; which was certainly not owing either to want of talent or want of hatred; and, as a controversialist, he was unequalled in virulence and fluency.

Lavington continued steadfast in his opposition to the new sect. A singular illustration of this antipathy is given in the first volume of Lady Huntingdon's Memoirs, while Whitefield was preaching at Exeter, in the open air, in the evening:—"The bishop and several of his clergy stood near him, and saw ten thousand persons awe-struck by his appeals. They saw also three large stones thrown in succession at his head by a furious drunkard, one of which cut him severely, but no assistance was rendered." At Rotherham, in Yorkshire, the preacher met with a reception still more brutal; the crier was publicly employed to give notice of a bear-baiting, and at seven in the morning the drum was heard. Some of these insults, inflicted upon him

during his various itinerancies, are narrated in the present volumes with an almost ludicrous solemnity. At Kendal, for example, he preached on the brow of a hill, to several thousand people; but at night, "some evil disposed persons got into the barn and stable where his travelling carriage and horses were locked up; the leathers were all destroyed and the carriage otherwise much abused; they also cut off the long tails of a pair of black horses that he had had a long time and greatly esteemed."

Let us not be misunderstood. There were many features in the early character of the Methodists, and there are many at the present day, which awakened, and deserved to awaken, displeasure and ridicule. We do not speak of doctrine or secession from the Church, but of the manner of delivery sometimes met with amongst what are called local preachers, the frightful scenes now and then heard of at "revivals," and the degradation of gospel truths by humbling associations—these were defects well calculated to excite disgust in refined and thoughtful hearers. The last quality is the most offensive.

There is a person of the name of Berridge who makes a very conspicuous figure in these pages, and whom Southey, in his "Life of Wesley," pronounced a buffoon as well as a fanatic. The biographer of Lady Huntingdon says he was neither. We think he was both. In what manner does the writer we have mentioned support his contradiction of the laureate? Thus: "Lady Huntingdon invited him frequently to meet, at her house, the elegant and courtly; and Mr. Whitefield called him an angel of the Church, and employed him as his own substitute at the Tabernacle." But the argument upon which he mainly relies is the appointment of Berridge, by the University of Cambridge, to the situation of moderator; an appointment, he thinks, that supplies a decisive refutation of the calumny. But a moderator is selected for his reputation in science or classical literature, without the slightest reference to his personal or intellectual peculiarities, separated from the studies of the University. If Rabelais had been senior wrangler, or senior medalist, in a good year, Rabelais would have been a moderator, even though the grins of Gargantua might be visible from St. John's to Downing. "But (continues the writer) he was familiar with the comedy of 'Aristophanes!'" Why an acquaintance with "Aristophanes" *should* make a buffoon, seems more easy to understand, though we have never heard of the buffoonery of Mr. Mitchell. The fanaticism of Mr. Berridge has been established by Southey on the authority of an eye-witness: that person gives an account

of the scenes in Everton church, at once painful and terrific. Men and children fell to the ground with terrible cries; some shrieking, some roaring aloud, some weeping in silence; some tumbling with a frightful crash, so that the adjoining pews trembled; some stamping with their feet. The pervading sound "was a loud breathing, like that of people half strangled and gasping for life."

To return to the attempts at mirth or drollery which deform so many addresses of early and later Dissent. We acknowledge that occasions may present themselves when even humour ceases to be profane. To this description belong many of the stories in Latimer and Fuller: where some important truth was to be carried to the mind and impressed upon it by a pointed phrase, which would be fixed in the memory. Such is the following anecdote in the "Good Thoughts" of our admirable Church historian: "When worthy master Samuel Hern, famous for his living, preaching, and writing, lay on his death-bed (rich only in goodness and children), his wife made much womanish lamentation what should hereafter become of her little ones: 'Peace, sweetheart,' said he; 'that God who feedeth the ravens, will not starve the Herns.'"

But these weapons are dangerous in any but skilful hands; and we can conceive very severe wounds to have been inflicted upon true religion by the lawless enthusiasm of Methodism in its youthful days: disdaining every restriction of propriety or good sense, these itinerating ministers seem to have justly exposed themselves to much of the censure which they received. There was a preacher in Lady Huntingdon's Connexion of whom many stories are told, but none more curious than the following:—During a journey through Wales he was powerfully tempted to abandon his labours in behalf of Christianity. When at length he overcame the temptation, he resolved within himself that he would match Satan (we employ his own phrase) for his attempt to deceive him. And so he did; for after a ride of a few miles, happening to come upon "a show of mountebanks," in the very act of commencing their entertainment, he, without a moment's warning, jumped into the midst of them, with the startling exclamation—"Let us pray." The performers were alarmed into silence by the sudden strangeness of the apparition, and having preached, as he informs us, "a tremendous sermon," he sent them home in terror and dismay. Now this extraordinary manner of preaching *may* have been beneficial in its working; but who will advise its adoption as a precedent? Every probability was against its success; and the mere instantaneousness of the

occurrence probably alone protected the missionary from insult and the Word of God from being trampled under foot. We denounce these displays of theatrical religion.

A similar disposition to press drollery into the service of the gospel was remarkably powerful in Rowland Hill, a sincere and warm-hearted man, but who permitted the vivacity of his feelings to overflow the boundary of taste, not to say of reverential awe. Without attaching any importance to the apocryphal stories so abundantly circulated respecting him, we may refer with confidence to his accredited biographer, Mr. Sidney. Our readers are aware that slips of paper were continually given to Mr. Hill before his sermon, relating instances of conversion or of judgment, with a view to their "being improved" from the pulpit. Upon one occasion he received the following note, which he read to the congregation—"The prayers of this congregation are desired for the Rev. Rowland Hill, that he will not go riding about in his carriage on a Sunday." Having finished the communication, Mr. Hill coolly added—"If the writer of this piece of folly and impertinence is in the congregation, and will go into the vestry after service, and let me put a saddle on his back, I will ride him home, instead of going in my carriage!" When Mr. Sidney asked him if this story was true, he answered that it was, remarking, "You know I could not call him a donkey in plain terms out of the reading-desk." We ask our readers what St. Paul would have said to such exhibitions as these? Surely these are jests which are not convenient. The soberness of the understanding is stimulated into excitement; and prayer itself loses not only its calmness, but its fervour also, by such outbreaks.

The same unbecoming temper of mind continues to be encouraged in many Dissenting meeting-houses, both in the provinces and in the metropolis. We have ourselves been accidental and unwilling witnesses, in London, to a scene of this description, that reminded us of the days when mysteries were performed at Chester, and the attributes of God were blasphemed for the amusement of the people. On the occasion to which we especially refer, the preacher introduced an account of a visit recently made to some villages in the Connexion, and imitated with great cleverness and aptitude both the dialect and the language of the poor persons with whom he had conversed. The dialogue was managed with remarkable versatility and address; and a stranger might have supposed that Matthews was "at home," for one evening, in a religious entertainment. The congregation was immense, and their joyous and excited coun-

tenances testified that a storm of laughter would have been drawn down by the smallest conductor. What fruit would be expected from such a travestie of the Bible? The biographer of Lady Huntingdon points with triumph to Dr. South. We are not going to defend the style of that most wonderful preacher, who told the truth, it was said, with the tongue of a viper. We consider him deserving of severe censure: but his error admitted an apology. He flourished at a period of our history to which it would be difficult to offer a parallel: he lived in the midst of a court, in an age of epigram, a carnival of laughter. Horace had come to life again, and Comedy wore the flowing drapery of Menander. However sweetly the charmer might warble, the national ear was closed to music; the everlasting drawl of Puritanism had scarcely died in silence; the ice of austere and saturnine habits was only just beginning to melt; the streams of good humour and rational mirth were but commencing their flow; it was the restoration of pleasure as well as of royalty, and both were received with acclamation, when—

> "Jilts ruled the State, and statesmen farces writ:
> When wits had pensions, and young lords had wit."

In an age like this, it was no slight merit to advocate the cause of religion at all. South encountered Ridicule with her own weapons, and galled her into decency by his sharp arrows: he drove down Hypocrisy wherever she showed her face: he certainly indulged too freely in his copious vein of satire; but the evil demanded a vigorous arm to correct it. Pope records a class of rhymers, who, however poignantly they might be censured, still continued humming on,

> "——— their drowsy course they keep,
> And lash'd so long, like tops, are lash'd asleep."

But the whip of South drew too much blood to suffer its object to repose under the infliction; Hypocrisy knew that she was watched, and that was a step towards her reformation.

Of all our modern poets, Cowper is regarded by Dissenters with the warmest affection. Do they, therefore, remember his opinion of drollery in the pulpit?—

> "He that negociates between God and man
> As God's ambassador, the grand concerns
> Of judgment and of mercy, should beware
> Of lightness in his speech. 'Tis pitiful
> To court a grin when you should woo a soul;
> To break a jest when pity would inspire
> Pathetic exhortation; and t' address

The skittish fancy with facetious tales,
When sent with God's commission to the heart!
So did not Paul! Direct me to a quip
Or merry turn in all he ever wrote,
And I consent you take it for your text,
Your only one, till sides and benches fail.
No; he was serious in a serious cause,
And understood too well the weighty terms
That he had ta'en in charge. He would not stoop
To conquer those by jocular exploits,
Whom truth and soberness assail'd in vain."

The Task, book xi.

This is very excellent poetry, and certainly very admirable advice; it may be read by way of commentary on that most judicious letter which the poet's charitable friend, Mr. Thornton, addressed to Mr. Berridge—

"I recollect (wrote that good man) but one humorous passage in all the Bible, which is that of Elijah with the Baalites; and when the time, place, and circumstances are properly considered, nothing could be more seasonable, nothing so effectually expose the impotency of their false god, and the absurdity of their vain worship. The prophets often speak ironically, sometimes satirically; but I do not remember of their ever speaking ludicrously. Our Lord and his apostles never had recourse to any such methods."

The great teachers of antiquity, Socrates and Plato, employed, we know, a very delicate irony in their discourses; but that divine revelation which was only foolishness to the Athenian philosopher, rejects every unhallowed instrument of warfare, and will prevail alone by the might of the Scriptures and by the unction of God.

Of the remarkable person who has given her name to a sect not very likely to be extinguished, we know not that any memoir can be given unconnected with the history of her heresy; but in offering a few remarks on her character, the outline of her life may be briefly stated. Selina Shirley was born upon the twenty-fourth of August, 1707, the second daughter of the Earl Ferrars. Descended from the House of Shirley, she could trace her lineage up to the time of Edward the Confessor, and claim relationship in blood with the royal families, not only of England and France, but of Denmark and Castile. Her childhood displayed marks of the seriousness that afterwards ripened into the Christian character: at nine years of age death appears to have occupied her thoughts; and her prayers for a religious marriage are said to have been frequent and devout. Her alliance with Lord Huntingdon, in 1728, only

partially realised her wishes—to the form of godliness he is reported to have united none of that glowing eagerness in religion, which at a later period characterised his wife. His character was drawn by Lord Bolingbroke, in a short epitaph remarkable for vigour and elegance—

"If he derived his title from a long roll of illustrious ancestors, he reflected back on them superior honour. He ennobled nobility by virtue: he was of the first rank in both; good in every relation of natural duty and social life. Acquainted by his studies with the characters of past ages, he acquired by his travels a knowledge of the men and manners of his own; he visited France, Italy, and even Spain. After these excursions in other countries, he settled in his own. His own was dear to him. No man had juster notions of the true constitution of her government—no man had a more comprehensive view of her real interests, domestic and foreign. Capable of excelling in every form of public life, he chose to appear in none. His mind fraught with knowledge, his heart elevated with sentiments of unaffected patriotism, he looked down from higher ground on the low level of a futile and corrupt generation. Despairing to do national good, he mingled as little as his rank permitted in national affairs. Home is the refuge of a wise man's life; home was the refuge of his."

This specimen of Bolingbroke's manner, in a style of composition not familiar to his pen, will not be unpleasing. The death of her husband released Lady Huntingdon from a chain that had restricted her exertions to promote a revival of religion within narrow limits; although they had frequently attended the society-meetings in the meeting-house in Neville's-court, Fetter-lane, where, in 1738, the first London Methodist assembly was formed. Lord Huntingdon died in the autumn of 1746. About six months before that event he had a singular dream, which was related by Lady Huntingdon to Mr. Toplady, and printed in his posthumous works. He dreamed that Death, under the form of a skeleton, appeared at the foot of the bed, and, after standing awhile, untucked the bedclothes at the bottom and crept up to the top of the bed, and lay between him and his lady. Lady Huntingdon was now in her thirty-ninth year. We find her in the following year complaining to Doddridge of the coldness of her heart, praying for zealous labourers in the vineyard; and mentioning the persecutions she endured on account of religious profession. At this period she was firmly attached to the principles and government of the Church of England; but she was willing also to encourage sincere men of a different persuasion. In 1748 she made a tour through Wales, and seems to have commenced that office of spiritual *overlooking* which she maintained during her life. In this visitation,

also we discover traces of those convulsive demonstrations of supposed grief for sin which occasioned no small share of obloquy to Methodism. Lady Huntingdon died at Spafields, June 17th, 1791, in the eighty-fourth year of her age, having been, during more than half a century, one of the most prominent persons in what is called the religious world.

Without controversy, when the family vault at Ashby-de-la-Zouch received her remains, a mother in Israel had departed. Southey, with every disposition to rate her character at a low value, called her a "sincere devotee." Of her sincerity no question can be entertained, and of her generosity in aiding the diffusion of the Scripture scheme of salvation, as she understood and interpreted it, all must speak with admiration. She is said to have expended, in the cause of religion, one hundred thousand pounds. At the opening of the College at Cheshunt, it was stated, that with an income of twelve hundred pounds a-year, Lady Huntingdon had supported a college, erected chapels in various parts of the kingdom, and maintained ministers to preach the gospel all over the world. But in this statement the eulogist omitted to record, though it is mentioned in these volumes, the munificent assistance which she received from opulent and liberal fellow-Christians. She appears to have been well fitted for the position she assumed, both by her mental and personal endowments; her understanding was clear and forcible, with sufficient obstinacy and self-confidence to render her the useful head of a party. Like Wesley, she loved to rule; and her intercourse with the ministers in her Connexion often reminds us of the Vatican.

Although absorbed by one great and overwhelming pursuit, Lady Huntingdon did not sink into asceticism. The innocent recreations of life do not appear to have been entirely abandoned. She was acquainted with the most eminent musicians of her time, and visited Handel, at his particular request, not long before he closed his eyes upon earthly honours. Her biographer gives an account of her musical friends:—

"I have had a most pleasing interview with Handel (are her words), which I shall not soon forget. He is now old, and at the end of his long career; yet he is not dismayed at the prospect before him. Giardini, whose great taste, hand, and style in playing on the violin, procured him universal admiration, was a great favourite of her Ladyship's. Lady Gertrude Hotham and Lady Chesterfield (who was esteemed one of the first private musicians of her day) gave occasional concerts of sacred music at their residences; and there Giardini's performance on the violin, in which at that time he excelled every other master in Europe, was heard with the most rapturous applause, and

equally astonished and delighted all his auditors. At Lady Huntingdon's request he composed a few tunes to some of the hymns used in her chapels; and this circumstance becoming public, led Horace Walpole to say that—'It will be a great acquisition to the Methodist sect to have their hymns set by Giardini.' Some time after he was recommended by Lady Huntingdon to the protection and patronage of Sir William Hamilton, whom he accompanied to Naples. About the same period there was another Italian composer and writer, with a name very similar, Tomaso Giordani, with whom Lady Huntingdon was also acquainted, and who resided so many years in London, that he was almost as well acquainted with the English language and English style of music as any individual of his time. He likewise composed some hymn tunes; and particularly the well-known air called *Cambridge*, adapted to the words, 'Father, how wide thy glory shines,' &c. in Lady Huntingdon's collection. Mr. Kent, of Winchester, was also well known to Lady Huntingdon, Mr. Whitefield, and the Wesleys. As a composer of sacred music, he followed closely the style of Dr. Croft; and few persons have succeeded better than he in that due intermixture of harmony and melody which renders this species of music interesting both to learned and unlearned auditors."—Vol. i. p. 230.

It was at the house of Lady Huntingdon, in Park-lane, that a preacher suddenly arose who soon excited universal astonishment by the vehemence with which he called sinners to repentance. His appearance was touching and conciliating in a rare degree; he was somewhat above the middle size, and of a very slender, but graceful figure; his complexion was beautifully fair; the expression of his eyes, of a lively blue, was not affected by a squint which he had contracted from a severe illness; his attitude combined the most exquisite elegance with the most hazardous and daring extravagance; and his voice was so clear, so musical, and so flexible, that the greatest actor of the time confessed it to be inimitable. The source of terror and of tears seemed to be equally under his power, and even the heart of the miser opened to the eloquence of his appeal. Wherever he came, thousands surrounded him; when he departed, multitudes followed him; his name written in books was regarded with superstitious veneration, and his blessing was sought with an ardour and passionate love that might have hung upon the neck of a prophet. His toil was unceasing, before sunrise, and long after sunset, he exhorted, admonished, consoled. They who questioned the propriety of his conduct or the purity of his rhetoric, acknowledged his enthusiasm. In the course of his long ministry he preached eighteen thousand sermons: his enemies were as zealous as his friends—they uplifted his name to public execration: his

actions were defamed, his virtues were denied, fraud and sacrilege were imputed to him.

"And Perjury stood up to swear all true."

Need we inform the reader that this remarkable person was GEORGE WHITEFIELD?

Among the distinguished members of the aristocracy who were admitted to hear the preacher in Park-lane, we find, upon one occasion, the celebrated Countess of Suffolk, "the Mrs. Howard" of Pope, and known to every reader from the adulation of contemporary poets. Like the Duchess of Buckingham, she regarded with aversion and surprise the new doctrines promulgated with so much fervour, and deemed it "highly offensive and insulting," and quite at variance with "high rank and good breeding," to be told, that her heart was "as sinful as the common wretches who crawl on the earth." Curiosity, however, induced Lady Suffolk to request Lady Buckingham's introduction to one of these religious assemblies. The result is very entertaining, if we may so speak of anything connected with so grave a subject:

"Mr. Whitefield knew nothing of her presence; he drew his bow at a venture, but every arrow seemed aimed at her. She just managed to sit out the service in silence, and when Mr. Whitefield retired, she flew into a violent passion; abused Lady Huntingdon to her face, and denounced the sermon as a deliberate attack upon herself. In vain her sister-in-law, Lady Betty Germain, tried to appease the beautiful fury, or to explain her mistake—in vain old Lady Eleanor Bertie and the Duchess Dowager of Ancaster (both relatives of Lady Suffolk) commanded her silence; she maintained that she had been insulted. She was compelled, however, by her relatives who were present, to apologise to Lady Huntingdon: having done this with a bad grace, the mortified beauty left the place to return no more."

Lady Suffolk carried her animosity with her to the grave, and even in her last illness, and when age had snowed upon her head, resolutely refused to admit Lady Huntingdon. John Nelson, a name not unknown in the history of Methodism, acted very differently when he heard the same preacher in Moorfields. Like Lady Suffolk, he exclaimed, "that sermon was aimed directly at me;" but, instead of being enraged, he began to examine himself, and to scrutinize more closely those features of depravity which Whitefield had discovered, as he thought, in his moral countenance.

Lady Suffolk was not the only woman of fashion whom curiosity or love of excitement (ought we to assign any purer motive?) carried to the house of Lady Huntingdon. In the list of names we find the Duchess of Montague, the Countess of Rockingham, the Duchess of Queensberry, Lady Caroline

Petersham, so famous for her portrait drawn by Horace Walpole, and who occupies so prominent a place in his inimitable party to Vauxhall; Lady Fanny Shirley, the "St. Francis" of his Letters; and the notorious Lady Townshend, whose mobility of religious feeling he has portrayed with such malicious veracity:

"Have you heard (he writes) the great loss the Church of England has had? On Sunday last, as George Selwyn was strolling home to dinner at half an hour after four, he saw my Lady Townshend's carriage stop at Carracioli's chapel—he watched—saw her go in—her footman laughed—he followed; she went up to the altar, a woman brought her a cushion; she knelt, crossed herself and prayed; he stole up and knelt by her. Conceive her face, if you can, when she turned and found him close to her. In his most demure voice he said —'Pray, madam, how long has your ladyship left the pale of our Church?' She looked furies, and made no answer. Next day he went to her, and she turned it off upon curiosity; but is anything more natural? No, she certainly means to go armed with every viaticum; the Church of England in one hand, Methodism in the other, and the host in her mouth."

Such hypocrisy ought to be given up to be tormented by the witty infidelity of the contemptible Walpole. For a few weeks Lady Townshend was an ardent admirer of Whitefield, who endeavoured to confirm her in her good resolutions. But she did not hesitate to sacrifice him to a pun. Walpole, having asked her whether it was true that Whitefield had *recanted;* she answered, "Oh! no; he has only *canted.*"

In the male portion of the auditory were names equally unexpected. There we see Selwyn himself, the gay, the brilliant, the universally popular—who glimmered into old age—in the same world of fashion where he first began to shine, and whom Wilberforce describes as an animated piece of wax-work; Bubb Doddington, still recollected in connexion with more illustrious men; Lord Chesterfield, the Petronius of his day, from whose wardrobe of elegant and alluring apparel, fashionable Vice still borrows her costume; and above all, the accomplished Bolingbroke—at once the glory and the disgrace of his age—in the contemplation of whose intellectual and moral features we seem, like Le Mercier, when regarding Voltaire, to be divided between admiration and disgust, and to hesitate whether to invoke the panegyrist or the executioner: the most powerful orator, the most accomplished letter-writer, and the most formidable controversialist of his time. Who can think of such an intellect so debased, without a tear? Who can behold, unmoved, such a temple without one shrine consecrated to heaven? In Bolingbroke, genius was not, as in many eminent men, solitary and

unaided—a prince without a vassal; he possessed those minuter talents which are the implements of genius—he had those accomplishments which may be regarded as its ministers. "In the senate, the most eloquent orator—in the drawing-room, the most finished gentleman." In Italy he might have passed for a Tuscan; and Voltaire said that he had never heard the language of France spoken with more energy or more correctness.

Well might Lady Huntingdon, in the fervour of a Christian heart, pray that his obdurate spirit might be shaken "to its centre," and regard him as a "singularly awful character." Both Chesterfield and Bolingbroke respected the earnestness of Whitefield, but their unbelief continued. Of the death of Chesterfield a short account is given, towards the end of the first of these volumes. Lady Huntingdon appears to have regarded him with feelings of lively interest:—

"I saw my dear and valued friend (her Ladyship writes) a short time before his departure. The blackness of darkness, accompanied by every gloomy horror, thickened most awfully round his dying moments. Dear Lady Chesterfield could not be persuaded to leave his room for an instant. What an unmitigated anguish has she endured! But her confidential communications I am not at liberty to disclose. The curtain has fallen—his immortal part has passed to another state of existence."

Lady Chesterfield sent for Rowland Hill, but her husband refused to speak to him. Of Lord Bolingbroke, Lady Huntingdon once ventured to entertain hopes—"You may command my pen (he said to her) when you will; it shall be drawn in your service. For, admitting the Bible to be true, I shall have little apprehension of maintaining the doctrines of predestination and grace against all your revilers."

In the list of Whitefield's hearers, we must not forget the author of the "Night Thoughts." Dr. Young had married the widow of Colonel Lee, and after his return from France, whither he had gone in the hope of restoring the health of Mrs. Temple, he met Lady Huntingdon at the house of Lord Bolingbroke. Lady Huntingdon's intimacy with Mrs. Temple naturally recommended her society to the afflicted poet. She introduced him to Charles Wesley, of whom he afterwards spoke in terms of praise, and whose sermons he is said to have admired. The biographer of Lady Huntingdon gives some particulars respecting the burial of Mrs. Temple, which we have never met with before—

"As the Doctor (he says) saw her gradually declining, he used frequently to walk backwards and forwards in a place called the King's

Garden, to find the most solitary spot where he might show his last token of affection, by leaving her remains as secure as possible from those savages who would have denied her Christian burial; for at that time an Englishman in France was looked upon as an heretic, an infidel, or a devil. The under gardener, being bribed, pointed out the most solitary place, dug the grave, and let him bury his beloved daughter. The man, through a private door, admitted the Doctor at midnight, bringing his daughter wrapped in a sheet over his shoulder; he laid her in the hole, sat down, and shed a flood of tears over the remains of his dear Narcissa."

The authority for this statement is not given, as it ought to have been; whence did the compiler obtain these minute particulars which have escaped the researches of the poet's biographers? Mr. Mitford merely alludes to the secrecy of this interment, which indeed is indicated in the well known line—

"With pious sacrilege a grave I stole."

Mr. Willmott, in the second volume of his "Lives of the English Sacred Poets,"* has given an account of the funeral of Mrs. Temple, upon the authority of an article in the "Quarterly Review" (for the year 1819) upon the cemeteries of Paris.

Whitefield exercised the most powerful mastery over the feelings when, as he said, he had only a mound of earth for a pulpit, and the canopy of heaven for a sounding-board.

"At Bristol there is a tract of country known by the name of Kingswood, which had formerly been a royal chase;† the deer, however, had disappeared with the greater part of the wood, and the discovery of coal mines had peopled it with a lawless race, totally uneducated and shut out, as it were, by their situation, from spiritual instruction. It was among these outcasts from society that Whitefield, upon Saturday, Feb. 17, 1739, mounted his first field pulpit. His congregation did did not exceed two hundred; his second rose to two thousand, his third to five, and the number rapidly swelled to twenty thousand. The trees and hedges were full of hearers. 'The open firmament above me,' he said, 'the prospect of the adjacent fields, with the sight of thousands and thousands, some in coaches, some on horseback, and some in the trees, and at times all affected and drenched together, to which sometimes was added the solemnity of the approaching evening—was almost too much for, and quite overcame me.'"

In voice, Whitefield might have contended with Homeric nerves. Franklin has left a most extraordinary account of its power; and no man was less likely to be betrayed into exaggeration. Whitefield, in one of his visits to America, preached

* P. 155. † Southey.

one evening in Market-street, from the top of the Court-house-steps, and Franklin determined to ascertain how far he might be heard. Imagining, therefore, a semicircle, of which his distance was the radius, he supposed it to be full of people, to each of whom he allotted two square feet: this computation gave him a congregation capable of hearing him distinctly of more than thirty thousand.

Preaching so violent, and so exclusively addressed to the passions, would not fail of producing lamentable consequences in many nervous and irritable temperaments; but of all the affecting occurrences which have come to our knowledge, the one we are about to mention is the most awful:—

"In some of his visits to Yorkshire, Whitefield was accompanied by Lady Huntingdon. Their worship was conducted in the following manner. Prayers were read in the church; these having been concluded, they adjourned to the church-yard, and the preacher addressed the assembled multitude from a scaffold erected for that purpose; when the sermon was over they returned to the church, and administered the sacrament to as many as could obtain admittance; the departure of these gave room to a fresh crowd of eager communicants; discourses were delivered at short intervals; and hymns *also* were sung. 'This,' exclaimed Lady Huntingdon, 'the world calls enthusiasm, but *I* call it the work of God.'"

The spiritual romance of Spain, or the saddest story in monastic legend, contains no incident more startling or more appaling, than the following narrative, which we give in the words of her Ladyships's biographer.

"At one of these assemblies, when Mr. Whitefield mounted the temporary scaffold to address the thousands spread before him, he was observed to engage in secret prayer for a few seconds. Then casting a look over the multitude, elevated his hands, and in an energetic manner, implored the divine blessing and presence. With a solemnity peculiarly his own, he announced his text: '*It is appointed unto all men once to die, and after death the judgment.*' After a short pause, as he was about to proceed, a wild terrifying shriek issued from the centre of the congregation. A momentary alarm and confusion ensued; Mr. Whitefield waited to ascertain the cause, and besought the people to remain still. Mr. Grimshaw hurried to the spot, and in a few minutes was seen pressing through the crowd to the place where Mr. Whitefield stood: 'Brother Whitefield,' said he, with that energy which manifested in the strongest manner the intensity of his feelings, and the ardour of his concern for the salvation of sinners, you stand amongst the dead and the dying—an eternal soul has been called into eternity! the destroying angel is passing over the congregation, cry aloud and spare not.' The awful occurrence was speedily announced to the people. After the lapse of a few moments, Mr. Whitefield again announced his

text. Again a loud and piercing shriek proceeded from the spot where Lady Huntingdon and Lady Margaret Ingham were standing. A thrill of horror seemed to spread itself over the multitude, when it was understood that a *second* person had fallen a victim to the king of terrors. When the consternation had somewhat subsided, Mr. Whitefield gave indications of his intention of proceeding with the service. The excited feelings of many were wound up to their highest point; all was hushed, not a sound was to be heard—and a stillness, like the awful stillness of death, spread itself over the assembly, as he proceeded, in a strain of tremendous eloquence, to warn the careless, Christless sinner, to flee from the wrath to come."—Vol. i. p. 265.

Whitefield was peculiarly apt in availing himself of every opportunity calculated to aid the natural impressiveness of his manner. The dreadful catastrophe at Lisbon, in the words of Warburton to Hurd, had made men tremble from one end of Europe to the other—from Gibraltar to the Scottish Highlands—

"A city wrapped in flames, and sinking in thunder, was a spectacle too terrible to be endured, even by the eye of meditation. The agitation of nature reached London, though with a faint and tremulous uncertainty. But comparatively slight as were the shocks, the popular mind was alarmed by the forebodings of some dreadful visitation of offended Providence. Even Luxury turned pale at the hand-writing upon the wall. Multitudes of every rank and station fled from the city into the fields. The chapels of the Methodists were crowded. Hyde Park swarmed with shuddering fugitives. Charles Wesley and Whitefield, who were in London at this time, preached incessantly; and Whitefield, amid the stillness of the night, proclaimed the power and glory of God to thousands in Hyde Park. The scene is described as peculiarly solemn and affecting. The darkness of the hour, the dangers of an impending earthquake, and the sobs of the multitude, could never be forgotten by those who were present. With a pathos that bespoke the fervour of his soul, and with a grand majestic voice that commanded attention, he took occasion, from the circumstances of their assembling, to call the attention of the surrounding thousands to that most important event in which every soul will be essentially and particularly concerned; namely, the grand final consummation of all things—the universal wreck of nature—the dissolution of this lower world—and the confirming and fixing the eternal and unalterable state of every son and daughter of Adam."

Surely some seeds of wisdom may have fallen upon good ground in seasons like this? And here we may quote a passage from one of Warburton's letters to Hurd, which is interesting for its allusion to the state of public feeling at this time, and deserves perusal, not only as a very happy specimen of Warburton's style, but for its graphic anecdote of the notorious Whiston:

"Pray (he asks his friend) did you feel either of these earthquakes? They have made Whiston ten times madder than ever. He went to an ale-house at Mile-end to see one who, it was said, had predicted the earthquakes. The man told him it was true, and that he had it from an angel. Whiston rejected this as apocryphal; for he was well assured, that if the favour of this secret was to be communicated to any one, it would be to himself. He was so enraged at Middleton, that he has just now quarrelled downright with the Speaker, for having spoken a good word for him in the affair of the Mastership of the Charter-house. The Speaker, the other day, sent for him to dinner; he said he would not come. His lady sent; he would not come. She went to him, and clambered up into his garret to ask him about the earthquake. He told her, 'Madam, you are a virtuous woman, you need not fear; none but the wicked will be destroyed. You will escape. I would not give the same promise to your husband.' What will this poor nation come to? It is in the condition of troops between two fires; the madness of irreligion and the madness of fanaticism."

But the madness of irreligion was the more dangerous of the two, for there was no reason in it. It is a fact, and it ought to be held in perpetual remembrance, that when Charles Wesley was in Cork, the grand jury presented him as a person of ill fame, a vagabond, and a common disturber of the peace, and concluded with praying that he might be transported!

Johnson always refused to allow much merit to the oratory of Whitefield. His popularity, he affirmed to arise from the peculiarity of his manner. He declared that he would have been followed by crowds if he had worn a night cap in the pulpit, or had preached from a tree. As this remark offers no very intelligible meaning, nothing need be said respecting it. In a conversation during his Scottish tour, Robertson observed, that if the eloquence of Whitefield had been cultivated, he might have accomplished great things. This opinion Johnson opposed, expressing a belief that he had done his best, and had taxed his abilities to the utmost. Boswell ventured to hint that he commanded the passions: but this praise was also refused him by Johnson, who denied that he could represent any succession of pathetic images. "He vociferated, and made an impression. There, again, was a mind like a hammer." At another time he said that he did not draw so much attention as a mountebank; and that he arrested the attention, not by doing better than others, but by doing what no one else would do at all. The eminence and genius of him who uttered it alone render such criticism worthy of the slightest consideration. His commentary upon Gray is not more illogical, nor more unjust.

To the assertion, that Whitefield did not excite public curiosity

so much as a mountebank it is sufficient to reply, that he drew away all the audience of the mountebanks, and that he contended with them upon their ground in Moorfields, and vanquished them upon it. Our testimony in his behalf is at least impartial. We dissent from his doctrine of election—we disapprove of his irregularities—we altogether reject his inflated phraseology—but we cannot refuse to honour his powers, or to believe that, in the hand of God, he was made the instrument of calling many unto righteousness. To deny the wonderfulness of his preaching, is to give the lie to his most famous contemporaries, who fully admitted it. Hartley, the clear and calculating metaphysician, spoke of his talents with admiration; and Bishop Warburton, of all critics the most arrogant, the most presumptuous, and the least panegyrical, emphatically observed—"Of his oratorical powers, and their astonishing influence on the minds of thousands, there can be no doubt—they are of a high order; but with respect to his doctrines, I consider them pernicious and false." This character of Whitefield was given at Prior Park, when Lady Huntingdon was dining with Warburton; and the biographer of her Ladyship relates a curious anecdote of the irritability that rendered the author of the "Divine Legation" so bitter in his polemics—

"A very animated and interesting debate (he says) took place, in the course of which Dr. Hartley ably defended Mr. Whitefield against the unjustifiable aspersions of his unreasonable antagonist, and proved the uniformity of his doctrines with the articles and formularies of the Established Church, and their accordance with the Confessions of Faith of all the Reformed Churches in Christendom. In this sentiment Lady Huntingdon, Dr. Oliver, and Mr. Allen concurred. Warburton's irrascibility and unappeasable malignity to what he denominated Methodism, could not endure this, and he hastily left the apartment."

This is very characteristic. The evidence of Franklin is still stronger than Warburton's. It is the tribute of unbelief to the power of the gospel. The circumstance we allude to, was this:—

"Whitefield, while preaching in the province of Georgia, had been amazed and afflicted by the abandoned habits and the squalid wretchedness of the new settlers; on his return to the more prosperous territories of America, he suggested the erection of a house for the reception of the numerous children who were left in destitution by the frequent deaths of their parents. To promote this benevolent object he preached many sermons, at which collections were made. Franklin approved of the design, but disapproved of the locality; deeming it more prudent to found the institution in Philadelphia. Whitefield

persisted in his original plan, and the sagacious printer determined that he should obtain no contribution from *him*. Soon after, he attended one of his sermons in aid of the proposed charity. The remainder of this story should be told in his own words—'I had in my pocket a handful of copper money, three or four silver dollars, and five pistoles in gold. As he proceeded, I began to soften, and concluded to give the copper; another stroke of his oratory made me ashamed of that, and determined me to give the silver; and he finished so admirably, that I emptied my pockets into the collector's dish, gold and all!' But the conduct of one of Franklin's friends, who was also present, was still more remarkable; he had taken the precaution to *empty his pockets before he came;* but before the conclusion of the sermon, he endeavoured to borrow of a neighbour, who, says Franklin, was, perhaps, the *only man* in the assembly not affected by the preacher."

When did eloquence gain a brighter crown? To excite the enthusiastic generosity of a republican infidel, was a nobler exploit than drawing tears from the eyes of Thucydides.

Johnson and others have regarded Whitefield only as the orator of the mob. That supposition is refuted by facts notorious to every reader. The Duchess of Marlborough and the sons of George the Second went to hear him. In his "chapel" might be seen the young Duke of Grafton, not yet pierced by the arrows of Junius; Charles Fox, William Pitt, and Soame Jenyns. John Newton mentioned, at a breakfast party, that he had often risen at four to attend Whitefield's discourses in the Tabernacle at five; and that at that early hour he had seen Moorfields as full of lanthorns as he supposed the Haymarket was of flambeaux on an opera night. His collections for charitable purposes exceeded any which have since been procured by the most popular preachers. He once obtained, by a single sermon in behalf of an obscure village in Germany, the extraordinary sum of six hundred pounds. It must be admitted, that upon that occasion he condescended to employ artifice to increase the subscription—

"After the conclusion of the sermon, he alluded to the intended collection in the following terms—'We shall sing a hymn, during which those who do not choose to give their mite, on this awful occasion, may sneak off.' Of course nobody moved; and when the singing was over, he directed all the doors but one to be closed, at which he took his station with the plate in his hand."

This story was related by Newton. Now we consider the unexampled extent of Whitefield's collections to be an irresistible proof of the power and influence of his eloquence. His *manner*, we doubt not, did much; but it would not do all. People may give their applause, their time, their wonder, to eccentric or

picturesque attitudes; to vehement and impassioned invective; or to quaint and original extravagancies—but they will not give their *money!* This is the test of eloquence. Here was no sentiment of pride—no desire of ostentatious liberality to be gratified—no greeting in the market-place could follow these anonymous contributions; the appeal reached the pocket through the heart. In our opinion this fact settles the controversy. Singularity will always attract a crowd: a tumbler soon collects his band of admirers, but the interest terminates with the exhibition, and the uplifted cap disperses the mob sooner than a constable.

Among the clergy with whom Lady Huntingdon became acquainted in her early career of christian exertion, Fletcher of Madely ought not to be forgotten. He was, indeed, a lover of the things of God rather than of the things of men. The vacant parish of Dunham, in Cheshire, was offered to him by Mr. Hill: the income amounted to four hundred pounds, and the situation was healthy and agreeable. "Alas, sir (replied Mr. Fletcher) Dunham will not suit me—there is too much money and too little labour!" Mr. Hill then proposed Madely, which Fletcher joyfully accepted, and never sought any other preferment. Of this admirable man it is impossible to speak without glowing into panegyric: in him we seem to behold a second Leighton. The beauty of his piety shone upon his countenance, and under the rays of that Day Spring which enlightened his heart, his face was, as it were, the face of an angel. When preaching in the French church in Dublin, many persons attended who were known to be unacquainted with the French language. "We want," they said, "to look at him, for heaven seemed to beam from his countenance." The histories of such men are the most eloquent call to the unconverted, and a day in the company of Fletcher was more salutary to the soul than a whole volume of Baxter. His virtues were not such as dazzle and bewilder the eye of the worldling; they were violets, to employ the beautiful image of Leighton, of a dark and unostentatious colour, but full of fragrance, and glistening in the dew of heaven. His latter days were enfeebled by sickness; but Hope, that sweetest bird of the Christian's spring, always sang to him in a voice that carried happiness to his heart—

"I keep in my sentry-box (he said) till Providence remove me: my situation is quite suited to my little strength. I may do as much or as little as I please, according to my weakness; and I have an advantage here which I can have nowhere else in such a degree; my little field of action is just at my door, so that if I happen to overdo myself, I have but to step from my pulpit to my bed, and from my bed to my grave."

The death of Fletcher resembled the closing scene of a Christian drama: he was seized with sudden and alarming faintings while engaged in his sacred duties, but he struggled through them, and with dying hands administered the bread of life! From the Church he was carried to his bed, never more to cross a threshold in the village of Madely. The inhabitants seemed to have only one heart. A solemn stillness pervaded every family; every cottage was a house of mourning; and one universal cry ascended to heaven in behalf of their revered pastor. But the Angel of Death sat by the pillow of Fletcher; and to complete the affecting beauty of the scene, he was supported up in his bed, and his parishioners passed in tearful silence through his chamber. His eyes had seen the salvation of his Lord, and in the early shadows of his autumnal evening he departed in peace. Fletcher promoted the cause of piety, not only in his life, but by his writings. He was, in truth, a man of genius. Adam Clarke, certainly a competent judge, pronounced him one of the first polemical writers in the world. But it is not in controversy that we love to contemplate the tender features of his character, for the flush of excitement will warm the complexion even of the purest Christian. Toplady, a most virulent opponent of Fletcher, said of his writings that the serious passages were dulness double-condensed, and the lighter passages impudence double-distilled.

And here we conclude these sketches, too hastily and imperfectly executed, of persons remarkable in their days for piety, learning, or enthusiasm. In the meantime, and while the conduct of the early Methodists is thus brought before our readers, let us earnestly recommend to their diligent meditation two aphorisms of two very eminent men, though differing widely from each other both in genius and in situation—Archbishop Potter and Robert Southey—"If you desire (said that excellent prelate to Wesley) to be extensively useful, do not spend your time and strength in contending for or against such things as are of a disputable nature, but in testifying against open, notorious vice, and in promoting real essential holiness." "It has been in the error (is the observation of Southey) of attributing an undue importance to some particular point, that sects have generally originated; they contemplate a part instead of the whole—they split the rays of truth, and see only one of the prismatic colours, while the members of the National Church live in the light." With these wise admonitions we dismiss the present volumes, which, whether we regard the persons to whom they refer, or the information they convey, are certainly among the most important contributions to the modern history of the gospel that have, for many years, been given to the world.

ART. VI.—1. *The African Slave Trade and its Remedy.* By THOMAS FOWELL BUXTON, Esq. (now Sir T. F. BUXTON, Bart.) London: John Murray. 1840.

2. *Travels in the West—Cuba, with notices of Porto Rico and the Slave Trade.* By DAVID TURNBULL, Esq., M.A., Corresponding Member of the Royal Academy of History at Madrid, and of the Royal Patriotic and Economical Society of the Havana. London: Longman and Co. 1840.

3. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to consider of the Petition of the East India Company for relief, and to report thereon to the House; with the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee, and an Appendix and Index.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 4th of June, 1840.

THE station of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton in society, as the man upon whose shoulders has fallen the mantle of Wilberforce, would alone give weight to his opinions and importance to his assertions: but this importance is greatly enhanced when we find those opinions confirmed and those assertions substantiated by other and independent authority.

We have but to look at the progress of affairs in Europe during the course of the present century, and we shall see reason to acknowledge in how wonderful a manner the blessing of Almighty God has rested upon this country. We behold her laying her mailed grasp upon the shoulders of the mightiest despot the world ever saw, and hurling him from his usurped throne, while she held out at the same time a hand to raise the depressed and despised negro to his legitimate position.

In this magnificent work of liberation, we see, if we *can* make a difference, more moral glory in the last portion than the first; and, greatly as we admire and highly as we honour the conquests of a Wellington, we are not quite sure whether we do not rate somewhat higher the laurels of a Wilberforce.

To make a trio with that great and good man and with Clarkson, is a distinction of no common character; and we give him a high place among lofty-minded men when we assign it to Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton.

To the man who is aware of the power exercised over the human heart by the baleful passion of Avarice, the present flourishing condition of the African Slave Trade will no longer be the subject of astonishment, although it must ever furnish him with matter for deep and abiding horror. The profits derivable from this abominable traffic are still sufficiently large to encourage enterprize and to repay speculation; *and so long as this is the case,* it would be in vain to hope for its suppression,

unless by the immediate interposition of Omnipotence itself. Monarchs have legislated and statesmen have negociated to no purpose, and societies and philanthropists are beginning to discover that their labours have been to a great extent unavailing, and to recognize the fearful truth that the slave trade, which they fondly hoped was rapidly on the wane, rages with increased vigour and unmitigated cruelty. The condition of the unhappy negro is now, indeed, more dreadful than ever, on account of the greater degree of concealment requisite in transporting him to the scene of his future labours; and the magnitude of his sufferings during the voyage across the Atlantic bears an exact proportion to the vigilance and activity of the cruisers employed on the various slaving stations.

It is plain that a remedy of a different nature from those hitherto practised must in this case be applied to ensure success; and such a remedy the excellent author of the work at the head of this article professes to point out to his readers. The first part of the book is chiefly valuable on account of the vast mass of information which it contains respecting the past and present condition of the African slave trade; and wherever Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton gives us the relation of facts, his statements may be completely relied upon. With the inferences drawn by him from those facts we cannot always exactly agree, although the deservedly high character borne by that gentleman is a sufficient guarantee against any intentional exaggeration of the extent and destructiveness of this horrible traffic. He proceeds, in the second division of his work, to treat of the only remedy which he conceives will be found available for the suppression of the slave trade. Open force has been tried, and tried in vain; and the treaties which have now been in operation for so many years have equally failed in effecting their object. We most heartily, then, concur in the opinion of Sir Thomas, that the christianization, and consequent civilization of Africa, is the only means to which we can now resort with any reasonable expectation of success for the entire abolition of slavery; and the methods which he has suggested for the attainment of this desirable end appear to be at once the most effectual which could be proposed, and to be comparatively easy of execution. This remedy must, however, be very slow in its operation, centuries must probably elapse before its design is fulfilled, and the pressing evils of slavery, and the abominable trade by which it is kept up, require some immediate palliation: the means of such palliation we shall by and bye investigate.

On the whole, the work before us is well worthy of the friend and coadjutor of our unrivalled Wilberforce. The author's

style, though occasionally deficient, both in force and fluency, is nevertheless perspicuous, sensible, and manly; and his work possesses one irresistible attraction, which serves likewise to distinguish it from the languid compilations of the mere statistical writer, it is evidently the production of one who deeply sympathizes with the unfortunate and unoffending: his only object is the benefit of persecuted Africa. Above all, he relies for the success of his plans, not on the wisdom with which they have been concerted, or on the energy with which they may be carried into effect, but in the overruling providence of the Supreme; for Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton is not only an unwearied philanthropist, but a sincere and humble christian.

Of the book which stands second on our list we can speak only in terms of the highest commendation. Its style is nervous and unaffected, and its reasoning clear and powerful. Those who resort to this work merely for amusement will probably shut it up with weariness and disgust, for Mr. Turnbull is no tea-table traveller. He rarely tells us long stories about his bed and his meals—we do not ever hear of the flavour of his coffee, or the stings of the mosquitoes; but notwithstanding these manifest imperfections, the "Travels in the West" will be found invaluable, as well by the statesman as the man of letters. As a body of well digested and well arranged information on the subject of which it treats, this book is only equalled by the celebrated volumes of the lamented Mr. Inglis; it is exceedingly rich in statistical details of the most important nature; and the "Historical Notices," at the conclusion, will not, we think, be accounted inferior to the former part of the work in interest or utility. Mr. Turnbull is an unflinching adversary to "slavery in all its accursed forms;" and it was with feelings of no small gratification that we read his lucid exposition of that inhuman system as it at present exists in the Spanish West Indian colonies. Our author is also (we are sorry to say it) a Whig, and in that capacity he indulges now and then in an ill-natured sneer at the Conservative party in this country—a practice really below a writer of so much ability and general good feeling. "The slave-holders of the South," says he, "are already but too apt to follow the example of our English Conservatives, risking all that is really worth contending for, in order to maintain some indefensible abuse." We really cannot comprehend what are the indefensible abuses so earnestly contended for by the Conservatives of Great Britain: and we think that Mr. Turnbull should either refrain from making such charges at all, or be at least a little more specific in his accusations.

We now proceed to the consideration of the positions laid

down by Sir T. F. Buxton in the first chapter of his interesting volume. He commences by stating the revolting fact that upwards of 150,000 negroes are annually transported from the continent of Africa, and sold as slaves on the other side of the Atlantic. (p. 15.) Sir George Collier (who, from his situation as Commander of a British cruiser on the African coasts, had every means of forming a correct estimate), calculating the number of Africans forced from their country in the twelve months immediately preceding the 16th September, 1820, at 60,000. Now, supposing Sir T. F. Buxton's computation to be correct, we have, in the short space of twenty years, the fearful increase of 90,000 in the number of human victims annually sacrificed at the altar of avarice and oppression.

We will proceed to examine the different items of which, as Sir Thomas informs us, this total of 150,000 is composed. First on the list we have Brazil; and the following information is given by the British Vice-Consul at Rio as to the number of slaves imported there—

For the year ended 30th June,		1828	42,496
Do.	Do.	1829	47,667
Do.	Do.	1830	56,777
			146,940

Thus we have in three years 146,940 negroes brought into the single port of Rio de Janeiro, giving an average, as stated by Buxton, of 49,643, (more correctly 49,646); and it is necessary to bear in mind that the last year's amount was 56,777.

From the reports of the British Commissioners for that year we have—

For the three ports of Pernambuco, Bahia, and Maranham, the number of	21,554
To which add Rio, as before stated	56,777
Total number annually landed in Brazil	78,331

This statement of course does not include the cargoes which may be landed on other parts of the Brazilian coast; which cargoes are doubtless, from the peculiar facilities afforded for their landing, very numerous. Twenty ships entered the port of Rio alone in the six months ended 30th June, 1836, reporting themselves "in ballast" from the coast of Africa, and making the customary declaration, that in consequence of the death of the master, &c., they had been unable to obtain a cargo. It was, however, well understood and connived at by the authorities, that these ships had discharged their freights of human misery upon some retired part of the Brazilian coast,

and then made the best of their way to Rio, to provide themselves with instructions and seamen and funds for a fresh expedition.

Sir T. F. Buxton next turns to the island of Cuba, and computes the number of Bozal negroes annually imported at 60,000, deducing that amount from the reports of British Commissioners in that colony. The case then stands thus—

Brazil	78,331	
Cuba	60,000*	—138,331
Taking the average of the years 1836 and 1837 for the number of slaves captured and carried to Sierra Leone, we have		7,852
Then in Havana in 1837		442
Slaves thrown overboard, shipwrecked, &c. say . .		3,375
		150,000

This latter item is merely a rough estimate; but it will appear, from statements which we shall bring forward hereafter, that Sir T. F. Buxton is abundantly justified in his computation. Porto Rico he finds it necessary to pass over entirely, as there are no documents respecting the importation of negroes which can be relied upon. But it may be as well to remark that (although the slave population in all the West Indian Islands is known to decrease rapidly, unless the deficiency be replaced by supplies from without,) the number of negroes in 1820 was 20,191, and in 1836 there were 60,000; giving an increase of 39,809. It is also a well known fact that one-ninth part of the vessels condemned at Sierra Leone in 1837 were bound for Porto Rico. Again, with respect to Texas, Buenos Ayres, and other Spanish American States, Sir T. F. Buxton declines giving any opinion, from the want of authoritative data on which to found a calculation; but it is undeniable that vessels are continually arriving at, or sailing from, the various ports in those republics deeply laden with negroes. The case then comes to this, "There is slave trading, although to an unknown and indefinite amount, to Porto Rico, to Texas, and to some of the South American republics."

"There is the strongest presumptive evidence that the slave trade into the five ports af Brazil which have been noticed, is much more considerable than my estimate makes it, and that I have also under-

* Sir Thomas F. Buxton is probably wrong as to the number of negroes imported into Cuba, as Mr. Turnbull, who had better opportunities of information, diminishes it to one half; but taking Porto Rico, the Spanish republics of South America, &c. &c. into consideration, Sir Thomas's total may be assumed as correct.

rated the importation of negroes into Cuba. There are even grounds for suspicion that there are other places (besides Porto Rico, Texas, Cuba, Monte Video, &c., and Brazil) where slaves are introduced; but for all these presumptions I reckon nothing—I take no account of them—I limit myself to the facts which I have established, viz.—that there are at the present time imported annually into

Brazil	78,331
That the annual importations into Cuba amount to	60,000
That there have been captured	8,294
I assume that the casualties amount to	3,375
Making together	150,000

(Buxton, p. 46.)

Thus, then, the number of slaves bought and sold has increased and is still increasing; but surely, though this be the case, the spirit of the nineteenth century has had its influence upon the slave trader and the slave owner—surely now, in this age of "liberal sentiments," the cruelties of past days exist no longer.

Let, then, the fourth decade of this very enlightened and most humane century tell its own tale, and we shall see that the slave trader and the slave owner of 1830-40 are the same as they were in 1760-70. First, then, for the trader: and his iniquities are divisible into those of the native African trader and those of the European slave merchant. Following this subdivision, and looking first to the abominations practised in Africa, previous to the stowingaway of the living cargoes in the ships that are to transport them across the Atlantic, we shall select two passages out of many from Sir Thomas's work—

"Mr. Leonard informs us, that about 1830, the King of Loango told the officers of the Primrose that he could load eight slave-vessels in one week, and give each 400 or 500; but that having now no means of disposing of the greater part of his prisoners, he was obliged to kill them: and shortly before the Primrose arrived, a great number of unfortunate wretches, who had been taken in a predatory excursion, after having been made use of to carry loads of the plundered ivory, &c., to the coast, on their arrival there, as there was no market for them, and as the trouble and expense of their support would be considerable, were taken to the side of a hill, a little beyond the town, and coolly knocked on the head." (p. 16.)

But suppose that there *is* a demand, then, of course, some care is taken of marketable goods. Alas! no; so easily is the human plunder obtained, that it is worth no trouble, no inconvenience, to preserve—

"Captain Cook also says that, in September, 1837, a number of slaves were suffocated on board the brig Generous, at Quilimane. The boatswain had, it appeared, shut the hatches close down after the

slaves had been put below in the evening. It was his duty to have kept the hatch uncovered, and to have placed guards over them: but this would have required his own vigilance, and he considered a sound sleep was to him worth all the slaves on board, especially as they cost him nothing."—(p. 118.)

This case came to Captain Cook's knowledge in consequence of a quarrel between the captain and the boatswain. "The pecuniary loss was all that was regretted by the captain."

We are most unwilling to bring forward pictures so dark and so disgusting to the notice of our fellow-countrymen, but what can be done—the lineaments of slavery must be exhibited in order to show what it is that we are fighting against. The public attention must be kept up, and above all, we must show that at this present day scenes as horrible are transacted in the dark places of the earth as any that ever disgraced the ages of Pagan antiquity.

Now, since we have seen somewhat of the dreadful preparation for that long voyage of sorrow, called, technically, the Middle Passage, we must take the reader with us on board the slave ship—an ark of horror, steered by demons in human form: and here again let Sir T. F. Buxton be our guide. After quoting a letter from Colonel Wauchope, relating many similar atrocities, Sir Thomas observes—

"Were it not that the evidence on these cases is unexceptionable, we could not believe that there did exist human beings capable of uttering such sentiments, or of performing such infamous deeds. Captain Wauchope, in the same letter, informs me that, on the 18th September, 1836, the *Thalia* captured the Portuguese brig *Felix*, 590 slaves on board. 'After capture,' he says, 'I went on board, and such a scene of horror it is not easy to describe. The long-boat on the booms, and the deck aft, were crowded with little children, sickly poor little unhappy things, some of them rather pretty, and some much marked and tattooed: much pains must have been taken by their miserable parents to ornament and beautify them. The women lay between decks aft, much crowded and perfectly naked: they were not barred down, the hatchway, a small one, being off; but the place for the men was too horrible: the wretches, chained two and two, gasping and striving to get at the bars of the hatchways, and such a steam and stench as to make it intolerable even to look down. It requires much caution, at first, in allowing them to go on deck, as it is a common practice for them to jump overboard to get quit of their misery.'

"The slave-deck was not more than three-feet-six in height, and the human beings stowed, or rather crushed, as close as possible; many appeared very sickly. There was no means of getting into the slave-room but by the hatchway. I was told, when they were all on deck to be counted, that it was impossible for any of our people to go into the slave-room for a single minute, so intolerable was the stench.

The colour of these poor creatures was of a squalid yellow, so different from the fine glossy black of our liberated Africans and Kroomen. I was shewn a man much bit and bruised: it was done in a struggle at the grating of their hatchways* for a mouthful of fresh air." (pp. 157-8)

Just one more extract, and most willingly do we turn to other, though scarcely less terrible parts of our theme. The following extract is taken from the Reports of the African Institution—

"A Spanish schooner, the *Viena,* when taken possession of, in 1822, had a lighted match hanging over the open magazine hatch. The match had been placed there by the crew before they escaped. It was seen by one of the British seamen, who boldly put his hat under the burning wick and removed it. The magazine contained a large quantity of powder: one spark would have blown up 325 unfortunate victims, lying in irons in the hold. These monsters in iniquity expressed their deep regret, after the action, that their diabolical plan had failed. Thumb-screws were also found in the vessel. From confinement and suffering the slaves often injured themselves by beating, and venting their grief upon such as were next them, by biting and tearing their flesh."—(p. 141)

Let us now suppose the dreadful voyage past, and the captive negro settled in the plantation: we do but change the nature of the tyranny; and the treatment of the African by the Cuba planter is but too well calculated a sequel to his treatment by the Portuguese slaver. Not, indeed, at first: for the trader is anxious to prevent the impression being made on the mind of the newly-imported slave of all the horrors of his situation. It is his interest, also, to keep up the spirits of his victims, that they may the sooner become marketable, and prevent their sinking under that fatal home-sickness which carries off so many during the first months of their captivity. The well-understood difficulty of breaking in men and women of mature age to the labours of the field has produced a demand at the

* "I want," says Sir Robert Peel, in a speech at Exeter Hall, "to impress upon your minds that in granting the twenty millions, the people of England did no more than rescue their own character from the degradation in which the slave-trade had involved them. In order to show that the trade was yet in all its sinful vigour, I will merely refer to the shipping list of the Cape of Good Hope. It is merely a commercial paper—it merely gives the record of commercial transactions. It is dated the 17th March, 1840, and one-half of the intelligence of the commercial paper is devoted either to the capture or shipwreck of slave-vessels. The heading of the articles are 'Fresh captures of slavers,' and gives an account of the progress of the trade; the next article gives an account of the wreck of two slavers off Mazalangie harbour—the crews and 200 slaves were saved. It was reported that those vessels had 900 slaves on board; but during a hurricane the hatches were battened down, and on opening them 300 slaves were found who had died from suffocation! Again the hurricane came on, the hatches were again battened down, and 300 more were sacrificed by the same cause, and 100 died upon the passage. What was the behaviour of the crews—what was the course pursued by them under such awful circumstances? They returned to Mazalangie for the purpose of getting a fresh supply of unhappy slaves."

barracoons for younger victims, so that it is not, as formerly, by going to war, but by the meaner crimes of kidnapping and theft, and the still baser relaxation of social ties and family relations, that these human bazaars are supplied. Soon, however, is the too flattering appearance dissipated: the slave is sent into the interior, and then his bondage begins in earnest.

Mr. Turnbull says, "In fact, the most dreadful of all threats with which one of the wealthy inhabitants of the Havannah continues to terrify a delinquent domestic from the errors to which he is prone, is to hint at the necessity of sending him to rusticate for a season, under the charge of the mayoral on his master's estate in the country. Under the tender mercies of the mayoral, he knows well upon leaving the Havannah that he has nothing to expect in the plantation but a wretched existence of over labour and starvation, accompanied by the application, or at least the constant terror of the lash, as an incentive, relieved only by the hope of that dissolution which sleepless nights and incessant toils are so speedily and so surely to accomplish."

Speaking of the sugar cultivation, Mr. Turnbull's remark as to one estate is, "With 211 negroes they contrived here to make 2,000 boxes of sugar." When we remember Mr. Turnbull's observation, that there was a general expectation throughout the island of a high price being obtained for sugar in 1840, in consequence of an anticipated diminished production in the British West Indies, the gradual increase up to that year, which we have described, can be by no means considered as the assumption of an exaggerated amount.

Nor is this all: the facilities still left for the practice of the slave-trade, and the consequent cheapness of young bozals at the barracoons, make it more the interest of the planter to keep up the number of his gang by purchase than by procreation. There are some so totally regardless of every human sentiment, save the sordid sense of their own pecuniary interests, that they people their estate with one sex only, to the total exclusion of females, taking care to prevent the nocturnal wanderings of the men, by locking them up in their plantation-prisons, called also barracoons, as soon as their daily labour is concluded.* As soon as the period of seasoning and probation has

* It is, in fact, but justice to others to signalise the case of a certain Mr. Baker, from the United States, who has established himself in the neighbourhood of Cienfuegos, on an estate where he has congregated no less than 700 male negroes, to the exclusion of a single female, locking up the men during the short period allowed for needful rest in a building called a "barracoon," which is, in fact, to all intents and purposes, a prison. Mr. Turnbull says, speaking of an intercepted letter, that it ran as follows:—"The vessels which have lately arrived have brought a large proportion of females, which we have not been able to dispose of at any price; on this account we recommend you to endeavour to embark the smallest number possible, or none, in order that we may dispose of the cargoes to advantage."

elapsed, the unhappy slave is made to feel all the horrors of his condition. In Cuba and Porto Rico, and probably also in the Brazils, that condition is unspeakably aggravated by the fact, that simple slavery exists in these countries in connection with the slave trade. There the planters find it more for their interest to import fresh slaves from Africa, than to maintain and increase their number in the ordinary course of nature, according to the system so successfully practised in the Carolinas and Virginia, Kentucky and Maryland, The severity of the penal enactments of the United States against importation has given rise to the domestic slave-trade of America, some of the features of which are nearly as disgusting, although not so murderous as the regular African traffic.

After the relation of these facts, the reader will be prepared for a specimen of statistics, perhaps the most awful ever submitted to mortal eye:

Of every 1,000 slaves seized in Africa, one half perish in the seizure, march, and detention; leaving 500 embarked for the middle passage:

Of these, one-fourth die before landing; leaving 375 exposed in the West India slave-market:

Of these again, one-fifth die in the seasoning; leaving 300 living at the end of a year—700, therefore, having perished!

Taking, therefore, Sir Thomas's account of the number of slaves annually transported from Africa to the West (and if the numbers be not correct, they err by being too small), we have an annual loss of life occasioned by *Christian* slave-trading to the amount of 248,000!

The slave trade and its consequences being now before us, as it regards its unhappy victims, let us next turn our attention to the causes of its increase, and to the means of its abolition. And first in the list of causes which have led to its present flourishing state, we must place (let not the reader start) the abolition of slavery in the *British possessions.* In saying this we must not be understood to express our disapprobation of that measure, but merely our regret that it was not properly followed up.*

Had *we* been permitted to legislate, we should have simply passed a law rendering every individual born from the date of its passing, free on attaining the age of twenty-one: provided

* We may observe how accurate the prediction of Mr. Canning was in 1833: "I implore the House, after recognising the principles embodied in the first resolution, to apply it with discretion, and to take care that we do not, by our legislation, increase the hardships of slaves in the Brazils and Spanish colonies, instead of obtaining any mitigation of their lot. Do not let us lay ourselves open to the taunts of those slaves, and let them say, 'Had you tried your experiment with more caution we might have been free.'"

always that the individual so claiming his freedom was able to read, and capable of undergoing satisfactorily the examination for the rite of confirmation: and further, that all children born twenty-one years subsequently to the passing of the law, should be free from their birth. Had such a measure as this been carried, inasmuch as the importation of slaves was strictly forbidden, the number of freemen among the coloured population would have gone on continually increasing, till, in the course of the next generation, slavery would have been extinct, and a well-educated free black population substituted for the ignorant slaves of the past age. The Government should, at the present time, have taken care that the means of education were rendered accessible to the slave; have prohibited, under severe penalties, the separation of families, the application of the whip to females, and furnished independent magistrates (not planters) to carry into effect its regulations. Provision also might have been made to equalize the condition, as to their entering on the enjoyment of freedom, of those born during the twenty-one years after the passing of such law. Such a measure was offered to Mr. Wilberforce in the year 1820 by Mr. Wyndham, but Mr. Wilberforce felt himself so committed to his colleagues in the advocacy of abolition, that he could not accept it. He subsequently much regretted this necessity. Among the many advantages which would have accrued to the nation from a plan like this, two deserve especial notice: The planter not having been deprived of his property, there would have been no occasion for an expenditure of twenty millions sterling to reimburse him; and, what is of still more consequence, the West India estates would not have gone out of cultivation, which is now, to a dreadful extent, the case.* It was, however, naturally to be expected that sudden liberty being conferred on the negro, he would not in all respects use it in the most judicious manner—some would scarcely work at all, others directed their labour to their own provision grounds; but certain it is that an immediate falling† off in the quantity of available labour took place, which deficiency has not yet been supplied.‡

---

* In Essequibo the traveller drives through cultivation, canals, trenches, and dikes, the same everywhere. The number of abandoned estates on the Corantyne, either allowed to go to bush, or turned to cattle-farms, are fifty-eight out of eighty, all reclaimable: population is the only requisite.

† "An idle negro, having a home and provision grounds, goes to the field, and, instead of a whole day's work, will content himself with half or a fourth; leaves the field, either sleeps or wanders about the trenches catching fish."—*Governor Light's Despatch to Lord Glenelg.*

‡ The value of the exports from British Guiana, *to all parts*, is thus estimated by Governor Light in his despatch to Lord Glenelg:—"The value of

Still, as the Government deemed it a solemn duty to proceed to the immediate liberation of all slaves in the British possessions, and in order to avoid the very appearance of injustice, voted the enormous sum of £20,000,000 to the West Indian proprietors, we can only look with admiration at the people who, in a peculiarly money-loving age, were willing, for the sake of pure justice, to make so splendid a sacrifice. But while all right of complaint is thus taken away from the West Indian proprietor, we must see that it is still the interest of the mother country not to let her colonies run to decay—not allow that which was intended as a boon to all parties to degenerate into a curse both to planter and slave, and more especially to the sable population of Africa.

As soon as it was evident that a serious defalcation in the quantity of labour was likely to take place, it became the bounden duty of the Government to encourage the immigration of free labourers.* And this not only for the benefit of our own colonies, but to check the impetus which such defalcation must give to the slave trade. The natural consequences of the abolition considered by itself, and unsupported by any other legislative enactments, were perfectly well foreseen by the slave

---

the exports of the colony may be taken to be two millions sterling, including rum and molasses; leaving out of account cotton and coffee, of which, though there may be some exportation, yet not more than the value of the sugar and rum consumed in the colony. One-sixth of diminished production will cause a diminution of exports to the amount of 330,000*l.* The production of this splendid colony has this year fallen off nearly *one-half.*" In short, the people of England, or their Colonial Secretary, seem to have been struck with insanity; he stops immigration by way of benevolence, and aggravates the bloody horrors of slavery by way of expediency.

* Mr. Burnley, in a letter to Lord John Russell, dated the 13th of December, 1839, states, that there is a population of 500,000 free coloured persons in America, ready, as you see by the following affecting passage taken from that letter, to place themselves under the protection of your sympathizing Government. "The most intelligent of the free coloured class are of opinion that in proportion to the continuance of this discussion will their actual position be deteriorated; that the well-meant efforts of their friends will only render their condition more galling; and that the expectation of the two races being ever allowed to co-exist in a state of social equality will become every day more hopeless. Emigration has consequently been often contemplated by them as a means of relief. They have looked to the West, but abandoned the idea, from the certainty of being soon overtaken by the powerful tide of American colonization; and to the North, under British Canadian protection, but the severity of the winter, which they feel to be unsuited to the constitutions of their race, presented a sufficient obstacle. To colonization in Africa they will not listen for an instant, for reasons which will be subsequently noticed. These subjects were under frequent discussion when the sudden extinction of slavery by Parliament, accompanied by the strongest expressions of kindness towards the negro race from the whole population of Britain, seems to have turned their attention to the prospect of finding in our West India colonies, a congenial climate, under the protection of a sympathizing Government."

colonies of Cuba, Porto Rico, by the empire of Brazil, and by the Spanish Republics of South America.

Now, as though purposely to check this most undesirable result, there was providentially a large body of labourers to whom the climate was no objection, who were willing to work and anxious to emigrate. They were in a state of nominal freedom at home, but real slavery, and by their removal, or the removal of a part of them to the West, two points would have been gained at once towards the putting down of bondage. First, the West India colonies would be made productive, and the value of slave-labour sugar would fall in the market; Secondly, the oppression to which the race in question was subjected would necessarily be mitigated, by the power given to them of emigration. This race of men is that of the Hill Coolies of India. The very Government, however, which had sacrificed twenty millions of national property to remunerate the West Indian planter for the loss of his slaves refused to interfere with the local Indian authorities, when that interference would have restored to the enjoyment of liberty men *illegally* held in virtual slavery. Nay, more, when a few coolies had been obtained in Guiana, a complaint was made, on the part of interested persons, that they were not well treated, and representations made in India to the same effect reconcile the rest to their detention.* On this subject let Governor Light, both an honest and a competent witness, speak. The following is an extract of a letter from that gentleman to Lord Glenelg:—

"Governor's Residence, Demerara, 16th July, 1839.

"My Lord—I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship the result of an enquiry instituted in consequence of information received by Mr. Young, government secretary, from Mr. Scoble, alleging ill-treatment of coolies on plantation Vriedestein. That gentleman has raked up every incident connected with the coolies with a perseverance that I trust proceeds from worthy motives. The investigation does not bear out his charges. I have thought it my duty to forward the documents for your Lordship's information.

"In my late visit to Berbice, I went with the sheriff to Highbury, where one hundred and thirteen coolies, men, women, and children, are located; eighty-four men were assembled for my inspection. I have seen many gangs of black labourers since I have been in the West Indies, and I may venture to say I never saw content and health more marked than in the coolies."

That the Governor of Demerara did not speak without authority in this matter, let the following document, forwarded by him to Lord Glenelg, bear witness—

* We shall not now enlarge upon the miseries endured by the coolies in India. We purpose before long to devote a paper to the subject of slavery in British India and in America.

"The terms on which emigrants will be received prove that there is no wish to hold out false representations. We say that if persons are disposed to emigrate, a passage shall be granted them free of expense; but they must provide certificates of having fulfilled the forms of the colony whence they come, so that security is given that no clandestine removal can take place."—*Governor Light's Despatch.*

"I propose to find them house-room, medicine, medical attendance, and a piece of ground to raise provisions, and to pay wages per month as follows:—

"1st class—Men who do full work, nine dollars.

"2nd class—Men and women doing a full day's work of 7½ hours, eight dollars.

"3rd class—Men and women doing three quarters' of a day's work, six dollars.

"4th class—Men and women doing half of a day's work, four dollars.

"5th class—Children from eight to twelve, according to age and strength, two to four dollars."—*Communication to Governor Light.*

But these applications were all in vain, and, as though to mock the misery of these unhappy men, they were permitted to emigrate to the Mauritius, a small island where but few of them could hope to find employment, and where, moreover, there was comparatively little want of their assistance, while they were debarred from carrying their labour to the only market where it was really in demand, and where the rate of remuneration was a high one.

This leads us to consider what may be done in such a colony as British Guiana, if properly cultivated; and all accounts in this one point agree, that the land is of such surpassing richness, and the colony so favourably situated, that it is one of the most valuable of our possessions. Governor Light well contrasts what it is and what it might be, in that important document to which we have already several times alluded—

"The future prospects of this colony," observes he, "depend on the regular habits of industry of the great bulk of the population. What it would lose by irregular cultivation may be judged by the mere effect of the absence of the labourer from work in the county Berbice alone —1,500 hogsheads of sugar in arrear in three weeks, at the lowest rate 30,000*l.* sterling; to the Treasury of England an equal if not larger amount of duty. Yet were Berbice possessed of a population double its present amount, regularly employed in the staple commodities, it is capable of production equal to that of the Leeward and Windward Islands united: the value of the three counties may be thus apprehended. Were the cultivation continuous, the drainage would be perfect, and the salubrity of the soil secured."—*Governor Light's Report.*

But is there any thing peculiar in the situation of Guiana in which the other colonies in the West Indies do not share?—Are

the negroes more than usually indolent, more uneducated, more vicious? We were going to say quite the reverse.

Sir Thomas F. Buxton is very anxious to acquit the negro of natural and incurable indolence,* and here we agree with him; but while the indolence is not incurable, neither is it as yet cured. But more blame is thrown on the negro than he deserves: nothing is more natural than that he should dislike the employment to which he has hitherto been driven by the cart-whip. The reminiscence is by no means pleasant; nor ought we to accuse him of "incurable indolence," because he prefers any kind of occupation,—fishing, trade, attending to his own grounds—to plantation labour. At the same time, that he does turn his attention to some, and that not unprofitable employment, is evidenced by the increased comfort of his condition and the superior style of his living: a fact to which Governor Light bears witness.†

Three things are especially deserving our notice respecting this colony:—1. The state of Religion—2. The state of Education—3. The state of Crime.

Return of Communicants at the Holy Sacrament during the Quarter ending 30th September, 1838.

1	Church of England	2,428
2	Church of Scotland	250
3	Reformed Church of Holland	
4	Lutheran Church	12
5	Roman Catholic Church	
6	Church Missionary Society	20
7	Wesleyan Missionary Society	1,346
8	London Missionary Society	1,854
9	Moravian Missionary Society	
		‡5,910

* "It is confessed by every authority that wages have charmed away what used to be called 'the natural and incurable indolence of the African.' I do not say a single word here upon the controverted question, whether the negroes demand excessive remuneration. We may assume, for the sake of argument, that they are exorbitant. This may be a fault, though, under all the circumstances, not an unnatural or surprising one; but this does not touch my assertion, grounded upon all the papers which have been produced to Parliament, that, when satisfied with the rate of wages, they do labour industriously, and execute more work, in better style, and in less time, than when they were slaves. There never was a greater delusion, than that negroes could not be induced to work for money."—(*Buxton, p.* 528.)

† "Where salt-fish was issued in gross, hams are sold in retail; where coarse cloths were demanded, nothing will satisfy but superfine. Considering the immense resources of the colony for the cultivation of the staple commodities, your Lordship cannot wonder if I respectfully advocate the advantages to be derived from an influx of population."—*Governor Light.*

‡ A few returns wanting.

Return of Persons receiving instruction in Schools in British Guiana during the Quarter ending 30th September, 1838.

	Average No. Adults.	Ditto Children.	Total.
1 Sunday Schools	3,460	4,081	7,541
2 Day Schools	212	2,735	2,947
3 Evening Schools	1,919	421	2,340
	5,591	7,237	12,828

Return of Convictions before the Supreme Criminal Court during the Quarter ending 30th September, 1838.

	Males.	Females.
1 In the District of Demerara and Essequibo . .	1	0
2 In the District of Berbice	*No Court held.*	

Where can we find another colony, out of whose population one-tenth are communicants at the altar of their Church; where one-fifth are receiving instruction at schools; and where, out of a population amounting to 65,556, the Quarterly Criminal Court has convicted but one individual!

We pass now to the *Commercial* view of the question: and here so vast a press of matter lies before us, that we shall find it next to impossible to *touch* upon all, even important points. We may just observe, *en passant*, that not only are sugar and rum products with which the slave trade has to do, and the consumers of them, if raised by slave-labour, encouragers of the slave trade; but,

"The holders of shares in the Brazilian mining companies are still more directly connected with the slave trade. It is well-known that the mines of that country are worked by slave labour; so that every shareholder is not only a slave-owner, but, by the purchases of newly-imported Africans, which are constantly made by the managers of the Company, becomes a most efficient promoter and encourager of the slave-trade. If those ladies and gentlemen 'who live at home at ease' were only to witness some portion of the enormities committed by means of their money, and to promote their advantage, they would spurn from them the contaminated gains with loathing and disgust."—*Turnbull*, p. 133.

A petition presented by the East India Company next attracts our attention; it was presented in Feb. 1840, and heard by Committee on July 4th.

"The first complaint of the petitioners is, that although the sugar of Bengal is now subjected to the same amount of duty as that of the West Indies and the Mauritius, and the same principle has been applied to Coffee, the produce of the British possessions in India: yet in both instances the admission is fettered by restrictions which diminish its value. They say that the means prescribed by the 1st and 2nd Vict. c. 33, for extending to the other parts of the British ter-

ritories in India, the same advantages which were conceded to Bengal by the 6th and 7th W. IV. c. 26, are circuitous, tardy, and uncertain. Evidence is to be produced to satisfy the Privy Council that the importation of sugar into any particular district is prohibited, and then it is declared to be lawful for her Majesty in Council to issue an order allowing the importation of sugar from such district into Great Britain at the lower rate of duty."—*Report E. I. C.*

In support of this complaint, Mr. Larpent, the Chairman of the East India and China Association, stated, that—

"The parties in India think that the proof of such prohibition should be left to the authorities in India, and not reserved, as it were, for the satisfaction of the Privy Council here, which would raise open questions as to the nature and extent of the prohibition to import sugars, and would perhaps throw obstacles in the way of these Presidencies of India (which, by their own authority, prohibit the importation of sugar), benefitting by the advantage of being placed on an equal footing of duty with the West Indies."

Now, so far as the export trade in refined sugar is concerned, the petition need not have been presented at all. Even slave-labour sugar may be imported for that purpose, though the refiner cannot use the free-labour sugar of our own colonies to make refined sugar for exportation, owing to its price at present being considerably higher than that which is made by slave-labour, nevertheless the law permits him to use this slave-labour sugar *to any extent he pleases*, provided he exports every pound of refined sugar which he makes from it. So far, then, the refiner has no cause to complain.

Again, the evidence of Mr. McQueen goes far to shew the unfairness of the petition in other respects.* He considers

* "Quest. 326.—If any great improvement was given to the cultivation of sugar, should you look to the East Indies being able to supply any portion of Europe?

"I should not, as long as I find the immense quantity annually increasing from *Cuba, from the Brazils, and from those colonies where they are enabled, by introducing an increased number of slaves*, to open fresh and rich land, and thereby to produce sugar to a very great extent. It is to that cause and the increase of quantity from Java, that I attribute the low price on the continent.

"327.—Then you would look to England alone to increase the exportation of sugar from the East Indies.—Yes."—*Report E. I. C.*

"There will be some difficulties in the undertaking, and I am not sanguine as to its early success," said Sir Robert Peel, at Exeter Hall, on the 1st of June last, alluding to the possibility of extinguishing the slave trade merely by means of the civilization of Africa. "Yes! my friends, you will have to encounter insurmountable difficulties, if you do not urge the Government to take into their immediate consideration the all-important subject of free immigration into your own colonies, Only look for one moment upon the appalling spectacle which is even now presented to your eyes—your colonies going to decay for want of a sufficient population. And as you allow them to decline in productiveness, turn your eyes from Jamaica to Cuba, and behold the scenes which are there promoted by their decay. See how you are now tempted by

that the East Indian sugar is introduced in a more refined state than the West Indian, and consequently the duty presses less heavily upon it.

"He considers, too, that the West Indies are, as compared with the East Indies, subjected to a disadvantnge by being compelled to purchase fish, lumber, and certain other articles, from the British North American Colonies at a higher price than they could obtain such articles from the United States."

The next part of the petition is for an equalization of the duties upon East and West India rum.

Mr. Larpent says, on the part of the East Indians, that rum is a component part of the cane manufacture; and that when sugar was placed on the same footing in the East and West Indies, East India rum should have been considered, as the Mauritius rum has been, entitled to all similar advantages.

With the prayer, then, of this petition we acknowledge we do not coincide. There is a great appearance of fairness about it, which an attentive examination of the circumstances will hardly fail to dispel.

The East India grower complains that he cannot throw his rum into the market with due advantage, because it is saddled with a duty of 15*s.* per gallon, while that produced in our West India colonies comes in at a duty of 9*s.*: he, asks, therefore, that the duties shall be equalized. We have already seen the state of British Guiana and the West India Islands under present arrangements; and we think there can be no doubt whatever that if the petition be listened to, West India rum becomes a mere drug, and a tremendous addition is made to those causes which are daily depreciating West India property. Comparing the rate of wages, and not only the rate of wages, but also the facilities of obtaining labour at *any* rate, we shall see that before our equalization of these duties, labourers of *all descriptions*, who are willing, should be not only permitted, but encouraged to migrate into the West Indies; a due time should be given to bring the forsaken estates once again into cultivation, and *then* being upon equal terms, the East India grower might with more justice request an equalization of the duties upon rum.

This is, however, the smallest part of our objection to the prayer of that petition. We are bound, as a God-fearing

---

petitions, such as I have submitted to you, to take for consumption from that increasing mass of foreign sugar by which you are surrounded! Tempted to enter virtually into a formal compact for the perpetuation of slavery throughout the world! Invited to tear up with your own hands the grand scheme for the production of tropical commodities by means of free labour, and urged to cast it from you, bleeding, as it were, by its as yet tender root."

nation, to attend not only to the commercial welfare of India, but to the moral welfare of our population at home. And we ask, What will be the necessary consequences of a measure which must send an almost unlimited supply of rum into the British Islands at a *retail price* less than that of any other spirit?

Cheap gin—that is to say, a nauseous compound of spirits of turpentine and nitric acid—sold retail at about ten shillings per gallon, is now and has been for many years daily destroying, by its not very slow poison, the bodies and souls of thousands. What then will be the effect of introducing a far more palatable spirit at the same or even a lower price, and one, too, which vulgar prejudice regards as "particularly *wholesome!*".

It is, no doubt, less pernicious than the abominable concoction swallowed by the British poor under the name of gin; but though a slower poison, it would be consumed in quantities far more than equalizing its deadly effects with those of "the spirit of the age."

Then, again, it is thought vexatious that the decision should be referred to our Government at home, whether any district does really keep out the prohibited foreign sugar or not. But when we bear in mind—first, that this decision when once made is final, so long as the fiscal restrictions in that district continue the same; secondly, that colonial discipline is notoriously far more lax than home discipline; and thirdly, that upon the due observance of the regulation depends the welfare of *all* our colonies, Eastern as well as Western, we must acknowledge that we consider the reference to the home Government not only *not* vexatious, but absolutely necessary. We cannot, we dare not, leave to the local authorities of *India* to decide questions which quite as nearly concern Jamaica or Demerara—questions which resolve whether the British possessions are or are not to be *inundated with slave labour produce* from Cuba, Brazil, and Porto Rico.

We take up this question on moral grounds: we know well that the opium grown in India is made instrumental to the corruption of many thousands of human beings, but we are not therefore entitled to say to the Indian planter, you shall grow no more opium. We know also, that the rum produced in India would, were its production encouraged, be made similarly instrumental, still we cannot say to the planter, you shall distill no more rum. All that we can do (and this it is our bounden duty to do) is to prevent its being made the means of still further demoralizing our own population. We would not willingly see rum as cheap as gin; we should be very sorry to see it

cheaper. There is the foreign market, and we would encourage exportation, for that is a matter of mere commerce. Other nations must decide upon what terms they will receive our rum. They are the guardians of their own morals, as *we are of ours.*

All these things, however, only prove the necessity of an influx of labourers in the West: and this influx the Government has as yet determined that these colonies shall not have.

We next proceed to the consideration of the remedies which have been proposed for the slave trade, and these divide themselves into four:

1. That which we have discussed at large, viz. the making our West India colonies productive, and thus enabling them to compete with those whose produce is obtained by slave labour.

2. That of Sir T. F. Buxton, to civilize Africa, and thus nip the evil in the bud.

3. That of Mr. Turnbull, viz. to give effect to the already existing laws on the subject.

And 4. To declare the slave trade, under all circumstances and under whatsoever flag it be carried on—PIRACY.

Now, *in limine*, it must be observed, that the first two and either the third or fourth, may be put into execution simultaneously; and if any good is to be done, to this plan must recourse be had, for the first expedient will necessarily be slow in its operation, and partial in its effects; the second, though universal in its consequences, will be still greatly slower in producing them; while the third and fourth, though only palliations, act both sharply and immediately. We have not left ourselves room to enter here into Sir T. Buxton's scheme for the civilization of Africa, and we regret this the less, as we hope all who have felt interested in our article, will immediately invest five shillings in the purchase of this handsome octavo, beyond exception the cheapest book ever submitted to critical scrutiny. We can only say that both in the plan itself and in the means whereby it is proposed to carry it into execution, long as it must be before any tangible results can take place, we most heartily concur. We wish its promoters "God speed," and feel ourselves privileged in being their advocate with the clergy and the learned world.

We pass, therefore, to the third plan—that of Mr. Turnbull: and before we can discuss this, we must explain to the reader what are the Courts of Mixed Commission, to which our author refers. In his dedication to Lord Clarendon, he says—

"Deeply impressed with the necessity of finding or creating a remedy more prompt, practicable, and efficient than any thing hereto-

fore suggested, my whole thoughts were turned in this direction: and in the following pages I have endeavoured to develope a plan, conceived in the midst of the scenes of wretchedness this traffic has produced.

"Should your Lordship do me the honour of following the train of reasoning which has brought me to this conclusion, it will probably recall one of those familiar expressions so often replete with force and meaning, peculiar to a language your Lordship has studied profoundly: 'Los que cabras no tienen y cabritos venden, de donde los vienen?' The Bozal negroes are the kids of the proverb; and I only ask for the Court of Mixed Commission the power to inquire from whence they came. The British judges are on the spot. The wedge is already entered: it needs but a well-aimed blow to drive it home."

The Courts of Mixed Commission are courts consisting of two judges and two arbitrators: one of each British, and the other Spanish or Portuguese, as the case may be. Before the commissary judges is brought the case of every ship seized on account of her being concerned in the slave trade: if the judges agree, she is condemned or liberated accordingly; if not, as most usually happens, then the arbitrators are called in, and by their decision the case is concluded. Now, at the Havannah, since the two judges usually differ, and the two arbitrators usually differ also, the case of few ships engaged, or supposed to be engaged in this traffic, could be decided, they have recourse, therefore, to an odd expedient, but one perfectly in accordance with the Spanish character--dice are produced, and it is decided by a cast thereof whether the English or the Spanish arbitrator shall be called in to assist the two commissary judges. In other words, the dice decide whether the slave-ship shall be liberated or not! These courts, however, do possess, according to Mr. Turnbull, power sufficient to abolish the traffic, if the powers were acted upon according to the additional articles agreed upon by treaty; but the practice of throwing the dice must be discontinued, and the *virtual* as well as *nominal* observance of the treaty enforced. On this subject we must refer to the work of Mr. Turnbull; we will just quote his words as to the results which he expects from such enforcement—

"In the mean time (observes he), let us accept the limitation of the increase to the power of these mixed tribunals, from the date of the ratification of the additional articles, without insisting on giving them any retro-active effect. The very first decision of the court, I venture to say, will operate like a charm. The whole machinery of the trade will be instantly disorganized; the newly-imported bozal will no longer command a price in the market: the mark of contraband is stamped on his person and cannot be effaced. A man is not imported, like a barrel of flour, for immediate consumption. Once landed, the

smuggled flour cannot well be distinguished from that which has paid the custom-house duties. On the contraband bozal, the marks of identity remain as long as he lives."—*Travels in the West, Cuba*, p. 395.

"The fate of the slave trade will be decided irretrievably by the first decree of emancipation pronounced by the court. Convince the trader that his goods are no longer marketable, and you may rest assured that he will not invest his capital in the unprofitable enterprise. The clipper builders of Baltimore will have no more orders; their ruffian crews will be compelled to content themselves with the moderate wages of lawful commerce; and the cold-blooded counting-house murderers of Rio and the Havannah, cut off from the exorbitant profits of man-selling, must seek some new investment for their ill-got gains."—*Turnbull*, p. 395.

At the same time, while we agree in the main with Mr. Turnbull, we declare, with the Liverpool Association, that the slave trade can never be put down save by the total extinction of slavery. Hence our sympathy with Sir Fowel Buxton, while we see plainly, at the same time, how very slow must be the operation of his scheme.

Of all the palliations which can be proposed, we most approve of that which declares the slave trade, under all circumstances and under every flag—PIRACY. We do not, we cannot see any objection to this: the French are not sufficiently interested in the odious traffic to afford any *real* opposition: and towards America it becomes us to take a high tone and a high position, and to insist on her *laws* being carried really, and not only nominally, into effect Men may risk property, and will do so, when one successful cruise in three brings them an enormous profit; but they will pause before they incur the danger of hanging in chains.

There is, we are convinced, no better way—no other effectual palliative of the slave trade, than always to treat it as PIRACY.

We began by speaking about the buying and selling of our fellow-men, and of the cruelties which attend that most accursed traffic; but as we proceeded, new and still new views opened out before us, and we discovered that the plague-spot was not one which could be cured by a mere topical application.

We found that by its consequences it had affected every member of our empire—our colonial possessions, our commercial interests, our diplomatic relations, our fiscal arrangements, nay, the very parties of our political world. We found that, in order to attack it with effect, we must attack it in a thousand points at once; and like Kehama, who in the same moment thundered over all the bridges of Pandalon—so must we assail this colossal monster. One thing we would strenuously urge upon our colo-

nists—it is that their true interest is to join heart and hand with those who are labouring for the utter and eternal abolition of *slavery*.

And now, in closing our remarks for the present, we remind our readers that we have not dismissed the subject. We have entered into the field as adversaries of slavery and the slave trade, and all that directly or indirectly promotes or supports it. In a quarrel like this, having once drawn the sword we have thrown away the scabbard—we shall return again and again to the charge. The East and the West—all colonial—all commercial questions—will pass under a scrutiny as severe as a Christian love for the souls and bodies of men can make it; and wheresoever *slavery* exists, whether it be in the opium grounds of the East, or in the sugar and coffee plantations of Cuba, or in the mines of Brazil, or cotton estates of FREE America, or the *cotton factories* of FREE England—to it will our notice be drawn, and against it our voice be heard.

ART. VII.—1. *Observations on Grammar Schools, and the means of improving their condition, and extending their utility.* By the Hon. DANIEL FINCH. London: Roake and Varty. 1840.

2. *A Bill for improving the Condition, and extending the Benefits of Grammar Schools.*

3. *Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales.* By NICHOLAS CARLISLE, F.R.S. Baldwin and Co. 1818.

THE "Observations" of the Hon. Daniel Finch, which have called our attention to the condition and utility of the Grammar Schools of England and Wales, are such as do credit to the good sense and Parliamentary experience of that gentleman. The necessity of a legislative interference to render these institutions as extensively useful as they were intended to be by their founders, has long been felt by the intelligent portion of the public. But whether the plans recommended by Mr. Finch and the framers of the proposed Act of Parliament above noticed be such as will *most effectually* tend to the improvements required, is a question for some consideration.

The subject before us is not one of yesterday. It was brought before Parliament by Mr. (now Lord) Brougham so far back as the year 1818, when commissioners were appointed to enquire into it and make a report of their proceedings.

"The reports of these commissioners not only contain an account

of the foundation and endowment of every school, but they also furnish a statement of the condition of each school at the time the enquiry took place, the amount of the income, the kind of instruction afforded, and, in general, the number of the free scholars, and of the boarders and pay scholars. These are the only authentic documents to which recourse is to be had for information as to the state of the grammar schools."*

Mr. Finch's pamphlet proposes but to furnish us "with notes of such cases as seem particnlarly to bear upon the several points which necessarily arise in discussing the subject." We are much obliged to Mr. Finch for the aid which he has afforded us in these "notes." The cases upon which he grounds the necessity of a legislative interference are few indeed, but strong. These are, however, only a sample of those which may be adduced to prove that many abuses have crept in and much corruption has been generated: at the same time, we are in justice bound to say, that the causes of these departures from the original intentions of the founders of schools have not been *always* traceable to the cupidity or the indolence of the masters. The malpractices of corporations, the tyranny of trustees, and the altered habits of the townspeople, may quite as often account for the decline of schools.

The "Act," although as to most of its clauses unobjectionable, fails in sufficiently expressing the great object for which the grammar schools were originally founded; as also in not clearly laying down the (*now* most important) principle, that RELIGION, *according to the Articles of the Church of England*, ought to be a main subject of tuition in schools. The preamble of the bill altogether passes over the well-known fact that by far the largest number of our grammar schools were founded for the purpose of promoting the Reformation. In the memorable Act of Edward VI. c. 14, it is expressly declared that Romish chapels and chantries were dissolved in order that they might be "*converted to good and godly uses, as in erecting of grammar schools to the education of youth in virtue and godliness.*" The object of these foundations was to raise up in every borough town of the kingdom a succession of men competent to search the New Testament for themselves, and to compare the Vulgate and the Missal with the original Scriptures, of which the one is a translation and the other a professed application.

Free grammar schools were an instrument devised by the wisdom of the Reformers to perpetuate the Protestant faith. Let not this most important object of their institution be ever

* Finch, p. 3.

forgotten. We feel persuaded that such men as Sir Eardley Wilmot and Mr. Hope, the reputed framers of the bill, do not hold this to be a doubtful or unnecessary distinction; they are aware of the fact; but they may have been afraid of urging it upon a "liberal" House of Commons, lest the bill should be defeated by the bigotry of liberalism. Upon this part of the question we are happy to have been anticipated by Mr. Finch, who gives it a his opinion, that "religious instruction is essential to a grammar school; and that the religious instruction required is *necessarily* according to the doctrines of the Church of England."* If the Act did but acknowledge and insist upon this provision, in *every case*, we should not quarrel with its preamble for not stating *all the objects* for which grammar schools were founded.

We thank Mr. Finch for calling our attention to this omission. We fully agree with him in thinking, that although the seventh clause, in retaining the jurisdiction of the ordinary over those schools in which Greek and Latin have been dispensed with, tacitly admits the religious qualification of the schoolmaster according to the doctrines of the Church of England; yet it does not define in sufficiently explicit language, that RELIGION *shall be a fundamental part* of instruction in such schools. This is a very serious oversight. Advantage may and *will* be taken of it, either to supersede religious education altogether, or to substitute the principles of dissent for those of the Church of England. In several of the new municipal corporations, which are official trustees of their respective grammar schools, the dissenting interest has the preponderance; and we cannot doubt the abuse of this power to dissenting purposes. Too great attention cannot be paid to this part of the subject; and we sincerely trust that the friends of the Church in both Houses will attend to it.

We are not quite so well pleased with another remark of Mr. Finch—that the Act is justified in dispensing with the teaching of Latin and Greek in those cases where the revenues of the schools are not adequate to the supply of competent men to carry out the intention of the founders. On the contrary, we think that *in no case whatever* has the legislature any right to do such manifest violence to the will of any founder of a grammar school. And again, we except with equal force against the compulsory clauses of the Act which would compel a master, appointed to teach only the classical languages, to add to his labours tuition in arithmetic, mathematics, or any

* p. 45.

other subject which may be considered by the town and the trustees an indispensable part of education. With these exceptions, we think the Act a very fair meeting of the question, and with a little alteration it may be made a beneficial law.

The "cases" which are produced in support of the necessity of such a bill are apposite and amusing. We have grammar schools *extinguished* for want of scholars, while the funds for their support continue and "fructify" in the pockets of their masters. *Free* schools are converted into seminaries for private pupils, and "town-boys" discouraged, and, in some instances, *flogged away*, to make room and respectability for the aforesaid boarders. An untenanted school-house is transformed into a pleasant vicarage upon the banks of the Thames; while a building erected upon the glebe of a rectory in Cumberland, and from time immemorial used as a school-house for the parish grammar boys, is claimed as property by a new incumbent, and converted into a barn. Cases such as these are to be met with in the Reports of the Charity Commissioners; with the exception, perhaps, of the flagellatory expedient above noticed. This rests upon the doubtful authority of the *Morning Chronicle:* and, therefore, *valeat quantum valet.*

Some of the cases brought forward by Mr. Finch are serious: they may almost be called ludicrous. We have a master of Berkhamstead school at a salary of 280*l.* per annum, with an usher at 140*l.* "How far the master had been resident did not clearly appear: no usher had been resident for thirty years! and *during the same period, there had been no boys!*" The free grammar school at Sutton Coldfield, in Warwickshire, conducted by a "learned layman," reported *six scholars*, and an endowment of 460*l.* a year. The average number of scholars at the grammar school of the county town of Warwick, for thirty-four years, was estimated at *five!* The grammar school of Cranbrooke, in Kent, mustered only *two* boys. Other cases of a similar kind might have been adduced, but these are enough to shew that "there is something rotten in the state of Denmark."

Mr. Finch lays considerable stress upon the Loughborough case, where a newly-appointed master having, at his election, entered into a bond to resign when called upon, declined to do so on the discovery that the trustees contemplated "an extension of the usefulness of the charity." We confess that, had we been in the master's situation, we should have been equally inclined to recalcitrate. For what was the resolution of the trustees? No less than that the master, *elected solely to teach*

Greek and Latin, should take upon himself the additional tuition (at the same salary) of "Arithmetic, English Composition, Geography, History, *Natural Philosophy* (!) *Political Economy* (!!) and the lower branches of Mathematics (!!!)

To a schoolmaster coming forward with such professions, we should be disposed to say, with *Mrs. Malaprop*, "Ay, sir, there's no more trick, is there? You are not like Cerberus, three gentlemen at once, are you?"

The trustees of Loughborough school were decidedly deep, and, perhaps, upon being foiled, thought the master a rogue; but we think he would have been a greater, had he undertaken to do what he could not honestly have accomplished. We have no objection to a moderate and reasonable "extension of the usefulness of a charity," provided that it be accompanied by a commensurate extension of teachers. But this *telescopic* production of a single man is neither fair nor useful. The good people of Loughborough must have had high notions of the capabilities of their children, or queer ones of the necessity of school instruction, when they hit upon natural philosophy and political economy as proper objects of education to boys of from seven to fourteen: for we conceive that few were intended to remain at the school after the apprenticing age. We gladly uphold every improvement in grammar schools which can be brought under the category of a substantial reform, but we eschew humbug as we do the popular ideas of Utilitarianism and every other *ad captandum*.

We think that it would well become the legislature to reconsider the clause which compels a master, *elected solely for classics*, to metamorphose himself into a teacher of writing and arithmetic, and book-keeping by double and single entry. We have some sympathy with grammar schoolmasters so circumstanced. They are, with few exceptions, graduates of the universities, and brought up as gentlemen, and accustomed to consider the teaching of such things as writing and arithmetic to be in the province of an inferior and less highly educated order of men. To *compel* them, therefore, to become writing masters, is to degrade them in the scale of society. But we shall be told that the Act provides a remedy for such extreme cases. That "the schoolmasters are placed under the protection of the Court of Chancery;" and that "there is an especial provision to enable those masters who may be unwilling to conform to any new statutes, to resign on receiving a pension." This is very well; but what is to be the amount of the pension? If it fall short of his whole salary, the master is decidedly *robbed*. We will put a case. The absentee of Berkhamstead, of whom honourable

mention has been already made, receives 280*l.* for teaching *Latin* and *Greek*. He lives at Bath or Tunbridge Wells, within hearing of the "*Qui hi?*" if wanted. His usher is on the spot looking out for pupils, but finds none. They have all heard of—

"Jonathan and William, who went to town together:
Jonathan took learning, and William took leather:"

And the upshot of the tale proving to a demonstration, that

"Learning is not half so good as leather,"

the natives of Berkhamstead will not venture, *ultra crepidam*. They may be in the *right*. But does this prove the Doctor to be in the *wrong?* "He is a defaulter," says the Act: "let him return and teach!" "But there are no boys," responds his advocate. "There will be plenty, if he will come back and teach writing and arithmetic." "But the Doctor, though he can construe through a brick wall, and has infinitely more taste than a crumpet, will be sorely puzzled to multiply the bricks in the one by the holes in the other: and as to *writing*, he writes, as Jacob Bryant used to say of a literary friend, 'the worst *foot* of any man in the county.'" "Then let him resign, and retire with a pension," vociferates the Act. "He has got one already," rejoins his advocate, "and is satisfied; and, what is more, he has earned it as fairly as half the old ladies and gentlemen upon the 'Pension List.'" We confess that we do not see any cogent reply to this last rejoinder. The Doctor must enjoy his sinecure as long as he lives; and when he dies, his successor may come in upon the Parliamentary terms, but it would be a manifest robbery to pension *him* upon compulsion.

The aggregate amount of the incomes of the grammar schools which are to come under the Act is stated at 88,000*l.* per annum. We fully concur with Mr. Finch in thinking that this large sum might be much better distributed than it is. But we would not divert the funds from their original destination. We could not insist that that which was founded to be a grammar school shall be a grammar school no longer, but a *Commercial Academy*. We would rather suppress it altogether in the town where Latin and Greek are not wanted, and unite its funds with those of some other school in some other town, where literature is "at a higher premium." For by so doing we should better fulfill the intentions of the founders than by diverting their charity into a channel in which it was never designed to flow. Wherever it is necessary and *practicable*, we would willingly see the addition of arithmetic, or a reasonable quantity of mathematics, or the elements of French and German: but as to your political economy, and such like "philosophy"—not-

withstanding the characteristic advocacy of the great democrat Milton—we consider them, in Persian phrase, to be nothing less than *chum wa hum*—Anglicè, *humbug*.

If the funds of the school be insufficient to pay additional masters, we would either (as the Act proposes) unite the resources of two or more schools, or call upon the town or county to make up the deficiency. For, surely, a county is as much interested in the sound education of its youth, as in the repairs of roads and bridges and county gaols. A liberal expenditure of its money on schools might greatly diminish the necessity for a larger allowance to prisons and police.

But our countrymen, we fear, have too little love of learning to admit the fulfilment of such a hope: they certainly have very little sympathy for schoolmasters or teachers. There is not in the country a more ill-paid or harder-worked body of men (the "working clergy" excepted) than the masters of our grammar schools. The drudgery of elementary teaching, the ingratitude of pupils, the unreasonableness of parents, the waste of intellect and of health, are not the only grievances under which these slaves of the public groan. We might add, in many instances, the no less galling tyranny of trustees, who omit no opportunity of making the unhappy schoolmaster feel his dependence, especially if he be a gentleman by birth and connexions; for vulgar minds, such as those of the generality of commercial corporations, have a particular pleasure in "humbling the pride," that is, breaking the spirit of a poor gentleman. But, perhaps, the most trying persecution of all is the patronising condescension of such persons, who cannot distinguish between their accidental position, as trustees, and their natural insignificance, as low-born and uneducated men; and, consequently attribute to their own personal merit the attention which is paid to their official situations. The protection of the Court of Chancery cannot be too amply extended over schoolmasters so situated: and especially in these times when the commercial spirit of getting the greatest possible quantity of work out of a man, at the least possible expenditure of money, has penetrated into the management of schools of much greater importance than the majority of the grammar schools which come under the operation of the Act.

The interference of the Court of Chancery, in remodelling schools, is confined to those which have no funds, or funds inadequate to the purposes of their institution, The number of such schools must be considerable, when we find that, out of 443, no less than 250 produce to the masters an actual income of less than one hundred pounds a year. Such being the case,

we wonder that the charge brought by the *Morning Chronicle* against one particular school is not more frequently substantiated against schoolmasters generally: viz., that of *flogging away town boys* to make room for private pupils. We are heretical enough to wish that there were no such things as free boys in any grammar school. The necessity for such poor scholars which existed two centuries ago, exists no longer: and the very trifling sums which are charged for instruction, even in the best public schools, ought not, and cannot be an object of consideration to any man whose station in life warrants him in desiring a classical education for his son. It would be a wise provision if the masters of all grammar schools were allowed to charge a moderate sum for every scholar whom they teach, say 10*l.* or 12*l.* a year. We are convinced that there are many parents, even among the humbler class of tradesmen, who would prefer paying something with their sons, rather than submit to the obligation of a gratuitous education. There is a pride in paying (and it is an honest pride, for it is that of independence), which seems to be innate in the English character. Moreover, it is a kind of security that our sons shall not be mixed up with boys so far beneath their own station in life, as to be ashamed of the association in after years.

One thing we are glad to see in the Act, and that is, an exception in favor of what are usually called "THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS." They are not required, *nolentes volentes*, to throw away their Greek and Latin grammars, and take to *Tare* and *Trett*. The reason assigned by Mr. Finch for this partiality is, that "it is notorious that in these schools the education required for a classical scholar is to be obtained."* This reason, we fear, "will not hold water." For it is as much as to insinuate that in the schools omitted no such, security for a classical education exists. The excepted schools are the following—Westminster, Eton, Winchester, Harrow, Rugby, Charter House, Merchant Taylors, St. Paul's, Christ's Hospital, Birmingham, Manchester, Macclesfield, and Louth; or "such schools as form part of any cathedral or collegiate church."

We can comprehend why those schools which are eminently and *truly* PUBLIC SCHOOLS, such as Eton, Winchester, and Westminster, should have the benefit of their rank; and also why those, less correctly, but still commonly called Public Schools, such as Harrow, Rugby, the Charter House, Merchant Taylors, St. Paul's, and Christ's Hospital, should be included in the favored list—*because they have friends in the senate*; and

* p. 60.

a kind of "pressure from without" acts like a buttress to their respectability. But we see no reason whatever why Birmingham rather than Shrewsbury, or Manchester rather than Canterbury, or Macclesfield rather than Bury St. Edmunds, or Louth rather than Coventry, or Norwich, or Tunbridge, or Tiverton—or any other good grammar school of county reputation—should lay claim to exclusive privileges.

That the four grammar schools of Birmingham, Macclesfield, Manchester, and Louth, are well-endowed, respectable schools, and in a condition to accomplish the objects for which they were founded, is true; but there are others as respectable which hold out equal assurances, and have, therefore, an equal claim to exemptions and immunities, if any are to be granted. We do not like distinctions which have a tendency to create jealousies between schools. The pernicious practice is already carried beyond the bounds of reason, without being sanctioned by an Act of Parliament. Mr. Finch adds his countenance to this practice by speaking of "six principal schools" and "the other schools:" and he falls into the vulgar error of reckoning as "principal," or in the first class, some which have only an accidental and transitory title to the distinction, while others, which have an inherent and permanent claim to be so distinguished, are considered among the "other" schools.

The fact is, that the proper marks of a "principal" or public school are not generally understood. The characteristics of a public school are three—

1.—A foundation open to all England. This is indispensable.

2.—A collegiate establishment, of which it is a part.

3.—A college at the University, to which it supplies the scholars and fellows.

Eton, Winchester, and Westminster, are the only schools which satisfy these conditions; and are, therefore, properly speaking, the only "principal" or "public" schools. And as such they are recognized by Acts of Parliament, which confine to these three schools the privilege of being held without a license from the ordinary. *Their* head-masters are also the only public teachers whose office is a title to exemption from residence upon their benefices. The next in importance is Merchant Taylors', which is open not merely to all England, but to all the world; and supplies *thirty-seven* out of *fifty* fellows to St. John's College, Oxford. But not being collegiate in itself, Merchant Taylors' cannot be classed with the three "principal" schools. The Charter House, being an open foundation and *quasi* collegiate, is in the same class with Merchant Taylors'; but not having a college at the University, is

of less public importance. St. Paul's, a free foundation and a highly distinguished seminary, comes next. Christ's Hospital is an establishment *sui generis*, and stands apart from them all, yet inferior to none in public services, and to few in classical honours. But Harrow and Rugby, which are usually reckoned public schools, have *none* of the marks which distinguish Eton, Winchester, and Westminster. They are *local* in foundation; have no college within themselves, or of which they form a part, and have only exhibitions at the Universities. We do not say this in depreciation of these excellent schools, which have so nobly borne their part in the education of the British youth; but we think it right to distinguish between inherent and adventitious qualities—between those which cannot be destroyed and those which are dependent upon circumstances. We will put the case distinctly. Suppose, by any accident, Eton, or Winchester, or Westminster, or Merchant Taylors', were to die of inanition; King's, New College, Christ Church, and St. John's, (Oxford), would be cut off from their supplies of fellows, and must apply to the Crown for a renewal of their charters. No such result could arise from the extinction of Harrow or Rugby. We hold, therefore, that the two last named schools are of *less importance* than the four above mentioned.

We exclude University distinctions from our characteristics of a principal school, because these are accidental; have been enjoyed in turn by all the greater schools, and usually in fair proportion to the number which they send to Oxford or Cambridge. The number of *eminent men* produced to the country is a better criterion, but still not decisive, for similar reasons. Neither can we allow that because a school is much affected by men of rank—it is, *therefore*, a "public" school—for upon this principle we might reckon some of the private establishments, such as those at Brighton or Cheam, *public schools*.

On running through the lists of eminent men educated at the grammar schools, and mentioned in Mr. Carlisle's book, we could hardly repress a smile to find that the only title to distinction which many of these "eminent" scholars enjoyed, was a baronetcy, or a squireship, or an earldom, or some other *hereditary* title, for which the young gentleman was indebted to his father, and not to any naturally elevating principle in the system of education adopted at his school. We have the authority of Cowper, that—

> "The parson knows enough who knows a duke."

But we do not think that a public school knows enough which knows little more than a game at football, with the scions of a noble house. At the end of this article we shall add a list of

really eminent men who have been educated at the different schools, which will give us some idea of what these schools have respectively done for society and their country.

That the NINE public schools have been excepted from the operation of the Act, we rejoice, because it is a compliment due to the zeal with which they have cultivated classical learning; and also to the alacrity with which most of them have accommodated themselves to the necessities of the times. For to the classical education which they afforded to their boys, they have added the two other most essential subjects of instruction—DIVINITY and MATHEMATICS: but of this "by and bye." After all that has been said or written against *public* schools (we use the term in its common acceptation), we are still of opinion that "out of the old fields comes the standing corn." And as to the "vices" which are so unceremoniously charged upon them, we see no reason to suppose that the devil will be more busy among three or four hundred boys, who are *amenable to discipline* and *responsible for their conduct*, than among twenty or thirty, who may "do each what is right in his own eyes," and—provided they do not quarrel with the police—offend against no law. Our own persuasion is—and we judge from the specimens which are to be met with in the Universities—that more low habits and degrading vices are to be found in *one* of the small private "academies," than in any of the great public schools of the country. The reason is manifest. The boys are sent to a private school, not so much for *improvement*, as for *impunity*. The tenderness of mothers is so apt to take alarm at the

"Ferulæ tristes scæptra pædagogorum,"

which they fancy to be in perpetual action at every public school, that rather than subject their sons to a chance of such discipline, they prefer the certainty of ignorance, and the risk of moral ruin at an "academy."

Encouraged, perhaps, by this reluctance of mothers to expose their children to the horrors and "degradation of corporal punishment," it has been the fashion, of late years, to decry classical schools as detrimental to "the intellectual development" (that is the phrase) of the boy who is to mix in after life with the wise, and the rich, and the mighty, who rule mankind without grammar, lexicon, or dictionary, but by the aid of their native wits and their mother tongue, and their experience of men and manners. Were it necessary, it would not be difficult to prove that there is something more in Greek and Latin than well turned periods and pretty poetry. We might claim for the "living dead" of Greece and Rome the honour of

having formed a *Canning*, a *Wellesley*, a *Wellington*, and a thousand others who have been deemed the master spirits of their age, and "have done the state some service." But such an enumeration is not necessary to shew that all the ablest men in ancient, and most of those in modern times, have owed no little of their distinction and power in after life, to the *classical* education which they had received in their younger years. It is notorious, that all the distinguished Romans were brought up at *grammar* schools, where they were early initiated into the principles of the Greek language and rhetoric.

"Many people complain (says an excellent article in the 'Educational Magazine' for January, 1840,) that our grammar schools teach nothing but Latin and Greek. It seems little enough, but what does it mean? In learning Latin and Greek the boy learns thoroughly the principles of *grammar*, which are common to all languages, but are not exhibited in such variety of detail, and therefore cannot be learnt so well in any other as in these. He learns the *history* of all the nations of the ancient world so effectually, that he knows not only the events and names, but the thoughts, feelings, and manners, of each time and people, almost as though he had lived among them; and thus he lays the only foundation of a rational knowledge of the modern nations which have succeeded the ancient. He learns *geography*. He learns to read *two languages*, without an acquaintance with which a man can make little progress in any of the higher kinds of knowledge, but which it is, nevertheless, hardly possible to acquire in after life. He learns to *write* grammatically and concisely. He learns what genius, patriotism, moral and intellectual energy and dignity *are*, by becoming familiar with what they *have done*. All his powers are developed to the utmost, and at the same time he is habituated to steady, hard work: he is trained to think of work as inseparable from life; he is educated to be a *practical man*. On this foundation, and with these habits, he has both the will and the power to build up all other kinds of knowledge. In the intervals of his school work, he seeks and finds refreshment—not in idleness—but in reading modern literature; intellectual labour gives an appetite for intellectual pleasure; and the boy who has been working at Homer and Livy, turns almost instinctively to Shakespeare and the history of England. So he goes on year after year, till the despised Latin and Greek prove the roots of a noble tree of knowledge, ever bearing fruits and flowers. The modern schemes, on the contrary, give neither sound knowledge nor manly and business-like habits of acquiring it: their promoters are like the children who stick flowers and boughs into the ground, and call that a garden."—pp. 50, 51.

Nothing can be more forcible or more just than the foregoing remarks. If, however, we might raise an objection to any part of them, it would be their *generality*. The writer attributes to grammar schools indiscriminately that praise of sound tuition, which our own experience would rather confine to what are called

"The Public Schools." Far be it from us to deny that in many of our borough and county schools both Latin and Greek are taught with much attention and considerable success. But besides the one great point of distinction between "public" and "grammar" schools—*the superior discipline* which is maintained at the former;—there is a second distinction scarcely less important—*their greater independence of action.* The masters in a public school have a certain routine of duties to perform, which, whether they be agreeable or not to the parents of their pupils, must be submitted to without a murmur, or the boys must be removed. And the University advantages of these schools are such, that there will always be a succession of boys eager to take up the vacated ground; so that the masters are free to follow out the principles of their respective schools without caring what any "*Philanthropos,*" or "*Alethes,*" or "*Parent,*" may write in a newspaper. They are confident of success so long as they adhere to the long-received and well-known rules of their own institution; and so long as they temper discipline with judgment, and keep up the *esprit de corps.* But in grammar schools, which are usually dependent upon the character of a single man, there is no such freedom of action or immunity from anxious care. A letter from "*Alethes*" may undo in a day the hopes of a score of years. The discontent of a sulky, or the depravity of a spoiled, child, may reduce the school to obscurity, and the master to indigence. The tenderness of a grandmother or the sensibility of a maiden aunt may mar the prospects of a learned man for the residue of his life. He must bear patiently with every idle excuse for absence—He must grant (though with a groan) every sentimental petition for the remission of work—He cannot say, with the head-master of a public school, of which we have heard, "*I will have no grandmothers or aunts*"—"*no belly aches allowed.*" No! The unfortunate master (?) must allow every indisposition which may be invented by avial solicitude, and deem himself happy if he be permitted to punish for those invented by the boy himself. If indeed it be true that

> "The schoolboy's delight is a play day,
> The schoolmaster's joy is to flog"—

then farewell all such joy to the master of a grammar school to which the boys are not bound by pecuniary prospects. He must seek his amusement in some other mode of torture: he must "reason" with the refractory, and "point out their error" to the stupid, and he will at least succeed in becoming an Heautontimorumenos of no small eminence.

Seriously, the difficulties of conducting a grammar school are

very great. Punishments apart, a thorough *grammatical education* is almost hopeless in the majority of them, since the measure of a boy's progress is to be estimated every half-year by the new books into which he is promoted, rather than by the manner in which he can analyze the old ones. In public schools of any reputation, one-third, at least, of a boy's time, for the first five years of his pupilage, is spent upon *grammar*. "Precept upon precept, line upon line," are engraven upon his memory, until there is scarcely a verbal inflexion, or change, or government, for which he must not satisfactorily account, before he is permitted to touch the higher subjects of prose or poetry. Syntax or prosody have been his daily lessons long before any but the most simple and easy works are put into his hands; and these more in illustration of *grammar*, than for any specific claim of their own. The result is, that the language of Cicero and Horace, of Demosthenes and of Homer, are so familiarised to his eye, that when he is admitted to read the authors themselves, he is not at every moment checked by obscurities or disgusted by obsolete words and phrases. A long course of grammatical training has brought him up to the mark with a confidence in his own strength; so that what to other boys, less carefully grounded, might seem to be insurmountable difficulties, to him are scarcely objects of a moment's hesitation. He is, therefore, at leisure to admire the beauties and to enter into the spirit of an author, and reads him with the more avidity that he has been so long kept from him.

We grant that if the number of books, into which boys may be flung headlong, be the criterion of improvement, the public schoolboy will be generally found far behind his contemporaries at *other* schools: but if his *knowledge* of Greek and Latin, *as languages*, be the question, he will stand in a very different position. The great principle of a public school is to *ground a boy thoroughly in his grammars*. To effect this desirable object much time and labour are necessary: so much, indeed, that ignorant parents have often made it a subject of complaint that their children appeared to be doing nothing; but let them wait patiently, and they will reap their reward. In public schools, indeed, they *must* wait, for the system will not be changed to please a capricious parent; but at minor grammar schools, to which the approbation of boys and mothers is "as the breath of their nostrils," any attempt at keeping a boy back for the purpose of grounding him in the rudiments, would be regarded as a gross and scandalous neglect: the father would be indignant, and the boy removed. Under such a probability, what is the poor master to do? His livelihood depends upon giving satis-

faction to all parties: there is but one way of doing so—he follows it and prospers: pleases both boy and parents, and is reckoned "a most worthy man." It is evident, then, that in those schools only where the masters are beyond the reach of impertinent meddling, tuition can be conducted with continuous success. And this remark reminds us of another class of schools, the illegitimate offspring of the *ten per cent.* mania of 1825, which being providentially checked in its main stream by the prudence of Parliament, trickled into the channel of PROPRIETARY SCHOOLS. Over the portals of these establishments ought to have been written, in golden letters, the following expository announcemen—

"In hac urbe non literarum studia celebrantur, non eloquentia locum habet, non frugalitas sanctique mores laudibus ad fructum perveniunt, sed quocunque homines in hac urbe videritis, scitote in duas partes esse divisos; nam, *aut* CAPTANTUR *aut* CAPTANT."

Might not such a legend very appropriately express the real object of the institution—a "*Net* Income" to the Proprietors? This bubble, however, like the rest of its contemporaries, has burst, and "Proprietary Schools" are fast vanishing from the scene. Those which remain are indebted for their existence not to any peculiar wisdom evinced in their foundation, but to the violent departure, on the part of their masters, from the principles upon which they were established. That principle was, that those who took a share in the pecuniary venture had a right to take a share in the internal management of the school. Whenever this theory was acted upon, the master and the trustees most naturally fell out, and the school as naturally fell to the ground. Wherever, on the contrary, the master had the courage to assert his freedom, and the trustees had the good sense to acquiesce in the claim, the institution prospered—that is, returned to the shareholders all the advantages which they could reason ably expect *eight per cent.* for their money.

There is no reason whatever why both grammar and proprietary schools should not be able to compete more equally with *(at least)* the smaller public schools of the kingdom; no reason, we mean, which may not be removed by a spirited effort on the part of the towns in which they are situated. The majority of them are superintended by able men, who have distinguished themselves at the Universities. The boys, for the most part, are made of the same materials as those of public schools; or certainly as those of the public schools of the metropolis, which are supplied chiefly from the middle classes of society. There is nothing wanting but *independence on the part of the master.*

His *fixed* income ought to be such as to be sufficient to support himself and a family, even if parental caprice were to remove every boy from his school. And, moreover, he ought not to be interfered with in matters which belong solely to his own province, and upon which governors, and trustees, and subscribers, and town councils, are for the most part profoundly ignorant.

To return to the objections against public schools. It is asserted with, we confess, some show of truth, that in public schools, much less attention is paid to the theological than to the classical improvement of the boys. We are afraid that, *generally speaking*, there has been much ground for this charge: and we are by no means satisfied with the defence set up, some years back, by Dr. Vincent, in favour of his own Westminster. Religion, in those days, consisted chiefly in *construing* and *parsing* the Greek Testament; and no one who has been at a public school can mistake such a task for a theological lesson. We believe, however, that although Divinity is still far from being admitted into the public schools as an integral part of their education, yet since the time of Dr. Vincent much advance has been made in them *all* towards this desirable object. We *know* that in some of them one day in the week is set apart for this duty, when something more than the Greek Testament is required of the upper boys, and every boy in the school is called upon to explain as well as repeat his English or Latin catechism; while Grotius and Paley, Nowell and Jewel, with occasional lessons in Biblical History and Antiquities, constitute the studies of the higher forms. We doubt whether School Divinity ought ever to be carried beyond these points. Boys are any thing but spiritually inclined; and do what you will, they cannot be divested of the idea that a *lesson* is a *lesson*, and as such only is to be regarded, whatever be the book or language. If, then, they can be brought to a *head knowledge* of theology—can "give a good reason of the hope that *ought* to be in them," have a general idea of Church History, and comprehend the Articles of the Church of England, it is as much as can be expected of their years.

We entirely concur with Mr. Finch in his opinion that "religious instruction is essential to a grammar school, and that the religious instruction required is necessarily according to the doctrines of the Church of England." The original object of the Protestant grammar schools being to carry out the principles of the Reformation, the rudiments of theology ought always to form an important part of their studies, if there be any pretension of fulfilling the wishes of the founders. We earnestly hope that in any new arrangements with the trustees, or any modifications of

the original statutes of grammar schools, this very important point may not be overlooked. Let it never be forgotten that they are PROTESTANT seminaries, founded for the sole purpose of sustaining the REFORMED FAITH, *and in indissoluble connexion with* THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

We have said that the public schools have not been backward in meeting the public demand for an extension of their studies. In proof of this assertion we adduce the fact that MATHEMATICS have been added to the regular course of education in them all. We are not aware of any exception. Westminster and Merchant Taylors' led the way in 1829; and Eton, we are happy to know, did not disdain to follow their example. Mathematics, we need hardly say, ought to be but a secondary consideration in grammar schools. For, with the exception of a few of the older foundations, which were schools attached to monasteries, the majority were founded (we cannot too often repeat the fact) to carry out the principles of the Reformation; and, consequently, the Greek and Latin, and in some instances Hebrew,* were taught for the sole purpose of arming the scholar against the heresies of the Church of Rome. Mathematics having no natural connexion with religion, do not form a primary part of scholastic education in the Elizabethan schools. But if we pass on from the original object to the present use of these foundations, as nurseries of the national mind, we must include the elements of the sciences among the desideranda of tuition, and perhaps ought to allow scope for the introduction of German and French. This, however, should be done with the greatest caution. We must not forget that there are but twelve hours in the day, nor disregard the adage—

"*All work and no play make Jack a dull boy.*"

It is a grievous mistake to demand too much of a boy's time for learning. If there be one quackery more pernicious than another, it is that of extolling a school because it has few holydays. One would think that the wiseacres who invented this modern refinement of tyranny—(for it was unknown in the more healthy ages of our grammar schools)—must have acted on the principle,—"*Magnum est humbug et prevalebit.*" The schools where this system has been unfortunately tried rue the innovation in the impaired energy of their boys, and consequent decline of their academical honours. While, as if in reproach of this counting-house principle of getting full value for your money out of the masters, that school which, of all others, is

* Hebrew forms a part of the regular school business at Christ's Hospital and Merchant Taylors'. At the latter it has been taught ever since its foundation, 1561.

notorious for its number of holydays, is equally distinguished for the number of high honours which its scholars have gained at the University. Our friends at St. Paul's will not, we trust, be alarmed at the publication of the above fact, for none but idiots would think of curtailing their hours of relaxation at the expense of their vitality: and their governors are sensible men.

We have said that great caution must be used in introducing any new subject into the studies of a public school—*caution*, lest it be carried beyond its own legitimate boundaries. There is some danger of this: for the spirit of emulation, which is always active in a public school, finding a new field for its exercise, will, unless checked, rush forward with redoubled velocity in that direction, to the neglect and injury of the older studies. The high rank held by a good Wrangler (which has now become almost an European order of merit) is very likely to act upon the susceptible mind of a public school-boy with a peculiar force of attraction; and in the energy of the pursuit he may lose sight of the more necessary branch of his education—his classics. There is something in the idea of "learning *things*" and not merely *words*, which is fascinating to a powerful and ambitious mind. We must, therefore, weaken the fascination by limiting the study. This limitation, moreover, will, in the end, be found of the utmost service to the scholar himself. For if he carries his mathematical pursuits at school further than is sufficient for his age and station, he will be in danger, when he arrives at the University, of presuming too much upon his acquirements, and thus losing a term or two at the very outset of his career, may fall into bad habits, and ultimately sink low in the list of honours. The highest men at Cambridge, excepting, perhaps, the Senior Wrangler and one or two besides, are not always those who take up most with them at their matriculation. On the contrary, indeed, it happens every year that men are disappointed and cast down who came up with the highest hopes, and, apparently, the best prospects of distinction. We would recommend, therefore, that school-mathematics be never extended beyond the following subjects—these, however, must be thoroughly learnt, for without a good grounding nothing can be anticipated but disappointment and disgrace—

Algebra: *First Part;* Euclid: *First six* and *Eleventh Book;* the *Elements* of Plane and Spherical Trigonometry; Conic Sections; Whewell's Mechanical Euclid; the Differential and Integral Calculus with their application to *areas* and *simple integration.*

These, *if well got up*, will be enough to warrant any but the very highest expectations at *Cambridge*. At *Oxford* they will promise the first mathematical honours.

We cannot take leave of public schools without dwelling

upon the most important feature in their constitution—that upon which their success mainly depends—their superior DISCIPLINE. In this respect they hold the same relative positions in reference to other grammar schools that the regular army holds in reference to the militia. A regiment of the line may now and then, through the incapacity of its commanding officer, be inferior in discipline to some *crack* regiment of militia; but, *in general*, there is no comparison between the two services in this respect. Long may public schools deserve this highest of commendations! A steady observance of discipline is the best character which can be given to a school. We would not, if it were possible, revive the days of Busby; but we do fear that the modern notions of punishment are any thing but favourable to the growth of learning or order in public schools. There is a sickly sentimentality upon this subject, which, being imported from the continent, is peculiarly uncongenial to the taste of the true Englishman.

It is very fine to talk about "the degradation of corporal punishment," or of "reasoning" with boys of from seven to seventeen, or of "governing them rather by love than by fear." We have in our recollection an amusing instance of an attempt of this kind, and of its consequences, which we will relate for the edification of all schoolmasters who may read these pages. We give the facts as they came to us some dozen years ago, but have every reason to rely on their *substantial* accuracy. A successful scholar left the University to take charge of a respectable grammar school in the west of England; his inauguration speech to the boys was somewhat in the following strain—

"Boys! I am not come among you as a severe master, but a kind friend. You are the sons of gentlemen, and as such I shall expect you to behave: and I am sure you will do so from your own sense of propriety, without compelling me to have recourse to what I detest above all things—the alternative of corporal punishment. It is my wish to treat you as young gentlemen, and not as mere schoolboys."

This announcement was received "with acclamations." The Chronicle of the borough declared it to be "a paternal address emanating from a heart overflowing with the milk of human kindness." The boys were in ecstacies, and the master thought himself in heaven, but too soon discovered himself to be in "the other place." Upon the first serious check to their eccentricities, "the young gentlemen" remonstrated with their parental master; upon the second, they referred him to their books—or rather the books to *him*, and brought the parties in such violent contact together, that the weakest went to the wall. We need hardly say that this was the master's head. Nor need we

add that a much greater degree of severity was required to reduce the "young gentlemen" to order and discipline than would have been necessary had the master commenced his career with a less paternal address.

Another remarkable instance of the failure of the paternal (or maternal) system, occurred at an eminent school "not an hundred miles from hence," under a late head master now "gone to his reward." So fascinating was the attraction which he at first held out of "no corporal punishments!" and "mutual instruction!" that half the kingdom were entranced at the discovery. The school rapidly rose from having been one of the lowest of the public schools in numbers, to be one of the highest. The excellent head master, "wise as a serpent, and harmless as a dove," congratulated himself upon more than four hundred boys, and an unknown number of pounds per annum in his pocket. Gradually, however, as the day advanced the mist dispersed; and when it had cleared away it disclosed a school of less than one hundred "young gentlemen;" the *boys* were all gone to other schools, where, instead of "friends," they found masters; and instead of teaching one another, they were taught. We once met with a somewhat ludicrous allusion to the discipline observed in this school, in what was supposed to be an impromptu of a Westminster boy, about to be flogged for knocking off and carrying away the head of a cherub from a monument in a neighbouring church: it was entituled—

A THOUGHT ON CHERUBIM.

"Oh were I but a cherub now,
How happy should I be!
The frown upon old ——'s brow,
Would have no fears for me.
For happiest of all imaginary things,
Are ye, blest family of heads and wings;
Ye are all bodiless, and therefore ye
From bodily infirmities are free.
Souls of departed boys,
Who can recount your joys?
Safe in all schools except ——. Where
They'd *pinch your ruddy cheeks and pull your hair.*
But here your happiness is never clogged:
Ye have no hearts, and cannot sigh!
Ye have no legs and cannot run;
But ye have wings and ye can fly,
Far from the consequence of fun;
Or stay behind—for it is all one,
Since ye *cannot be flogged!*"

We have much pleasure in announcing that under a change

of dynasty, the school in question is returning to a more healthy state; that the boys are increasing in numbers and advancing in learning; that cherubs, once so persecuted within its walls, may now fly through with as little injury as in other schools; for the birch (we wish it had been the cane!) is again doing its duty: cautiously indeed, but not the less effectually. "We wish it had been the cane," because we consider this the more legitimate instrument for the correction of school offences, which seldom amount to more than a neglected lesson, or a bad exercise. The birch, in our opinion, ought never to be employed, except in cases of a breach of morals. It should be used only as a peculiar mark of disgrace—a hint of impending expulsion on a recurrence of the necessity. We are persuaded, from our own experience, of the justice of this limitation—

"Ergo manus et nos ferulæ subduximus."

We have often compounded for a false quantity with a cut on the hand, whereas we should not have been so ready "to cry quits," had we been compelled to untruss before the whole school, for a fault which would have been sufficiently punished by the loss of a place.

"————————adsit
Regula peccatis quæ pœnas irroget æquas,
Nec scuticâ dignum horribili sectere flagello."

Young offenders are generally hardened by the birch, which, after all, is not capable of being employed so effectually as the cane, even in graver offences. And, as to the older boys, we think, with Cowper, whenever they require such chastisement—"their punishment obscene."

The "birch" is one of the very few things which we would desire to see "reformed" at Eton and Winchester. We use the word "reformed" in the same sense that it is used by the majority of the "Liberal interest," who talk about reforming the Church or the House of Lords. We would have it altogether abolished, "root and branch" removed, or making its appearance only on such grand festivals of sin as we hope would be of rare occurrence in the two leading schools of the empire. But Eton and Winchester are not the only places in which "the school master's joy is to flog." We have shrewd suspicions of Harrow, of Rugby, and of the Charter House. The statutes of the last are now before us, and we request the attention of the masters to the following benevolent injunctions in their orders—

"*They, i. e.* the masters, *shall be careful to observe the nature and ingeny of their scholars, and accordingly instruct and correct them. In*

correction they shall be moderate; correcting according to the quality of the fault in matter of manners, and according to the capacity of the fault in matter of learning."

In this "order" we certainly see grounds for a distinction in "correcting a *fault of morals*," and "a *fault of learning*." And if we cannot prove that a distinction in the *correcting instruments* is intended, we can at least find a reason for such a liberal interpretation. We love ancient customs—are a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, and in a fair way of becoming an antique fellow ourselves—but we cannot make up our minds to uphold the birch merely because it is an ancient instrument. We consider the *birch* to be of doubtful authority (in a classical point of view), notwithstanding the countenance given to its use in the fresco at Pompeii; for classical authors incline to the more general employment of the *cane*, or some rigid instrument of a like character. We know that our friend Juvenal was well *caned* for his delinquencies, if we may trust his own candid confession—

"Ergo *manus et nos ferulæ* subduximus."

Martial also had a sincere respect for the "ferulæ tristes," which he very properly calls *scæptra pædagogorum*." Perhaps, however, we shall be referred to a much higher era for the use of the birch. We are aware of the instance, and anticipate the objection: it is the case of Gideon, of whom it is said—"he took the elders of the city, *and thorns of the wilderness and briers*, and with them he TAUGHT the men of Succoth:" but we are not told in what degree his pupils profited by this mode of tuition. Moreover Gideon was a judge, and not a school master. We flatter ourselves that we are a judge also in such matters, having been under both systems at different periods of our boyhood—having chewed our caoutchouc* under a grim Etonian, and subsequently submitted our palm to the *ferula tristis*, or rather *tristior*, at another school, where the dry dusting was in greater request, and where the gaunt spectre of discipline was not

"Dripping with infant's gore and briny tears."

Having experienced the bitter and the sweet of both systems, we are free to confess, that although the *Juvenalian* was much more painful to the bodily feelings, yet the *Busbeian* was much less decorous, and far less agreeable to the mind.

But while advocating the superior classicality of the *cane*, we must concede to our opponents the melancholy fact, that in England the majority of schools are in favour of the more sangui-

* Our school-fellows will understand the allusion—ah! silice in nudâ!

nary instrument. Mr. Nicholas Carlisle, with infinite humour, has given us engravings of several seals of schools which bear upon them the impress of the facetiousness of the age in which learning was revived, and grammar schools chiefly founded. Out of eight characteristic seals, which particularly attracted our notice, five, we regret to say, are decidedly in favour of the Etonian method of discipline; *two* uphold the more cleanly practice; and *one* countenances the "reasoning" system. The first class belongs to a period which may be called the "the reign of terror" to school-boys—from 1552 to 1584. And really the list of seals is a curious history of the progress of civilization in punishments. The most terrific of all is the oldest—that of Louth, 1552. Here we are met by a vision, upon which we look with trembling. A most ferocious "tall," gownless fellow, has got a poor urchin *across his knee*, and is in the act of inflicting punishment, doubtless condign—upon his bare person; while over his head is the pleasant label, "*qui parcit virgæ odit filium!*" three good boys on the right look on with evident satisfaction, and two on the left are shrinking with terror, for their turn is at hand.

The seal of Macclesfield,* of the same date, is equally formidable to the mind, but not so terrible to the eye. The master sits by himself in a chair, with *birch in hand*—a sceptre almost as big as himself, and looks as if he would say "*Now, if you dare!*" The genius of discipline at Bolton (1566) is quite uproarious, being personified by a bearded, gowned, and hatted old gentleman, who forms the *crest* of an ordinary coat of arms, brandishing in one hand a book, in the other a *birch* of most formidable dimensions. As a relief to these terrors, the worthy master of St. Saviour's (1573) has suffered his instrument of torture, the same deadly weapon, to fall under his chair, while he blindly, or sleepily holds up a book, out of which a boy is saying "by heart." We fancy the indignation of our excellent friend, the present head master, whose opinions and practice are so orthodox, at this gross libel upon the discipline of his school! The seal of Oakham (1584) is conceived in as mild a spirit: the master, a *Laud-like* dignitary, sits at his table, surrounded by his boys, to whom he is "demonstrating" with his right hand, while the *birch* lies inactive upon the table beside him. The peculiar feature in this case is the diminu-

* Perhaps the peculiar character of the seals of these schools, and of Birmingham—of which presently—suggested to the framers of the "bill," the honorary distinction which they have conferred upon them. By these tokens they may judge it to be "notorious, that in these schools the education required for a classical scholar is to be obtained."—*Finch*, 60.

tion in the size of the instrument—a "figure" that we are approaching a milder age.

But our satisfaction is greatest in the master of *Blackburn* (an Elizabethan School), "a tall proper man," who, gowned and capped, stands "rectus in curia," with his CANE *bendwise*, or diagonally, across his breast, and a book in his left hand: he is "a schoolmaster all over," "factus ad unguem"—cool and determined. We cannot look upon him without saying, "*I will never do so again!*"

The next seal, that of *Camberwell* grammar school, brings us down to 1615, and, as might have been expected, to a still more pacific representation of magisterial power and authority. It is either a key, or a small instrument with a circular hole at the upper end. We *hope* it is a *key*, for if it be that weapon of which we have dreamed or heard, but, thank our stars! never *felt* in our younger days, ycleped a *ferule*—then our theory of gradation is at an end. The *English* ferule was (for happily *it is not*) a most terrific instrument. It lived by suction!—that is, the first blow which it gave on the palm of the hand raised a bladder, which subsequent ones *broke*, to the inexpressible torture of the culprit, and perhaps to the equal delight of his tormentor. But as we have never seen such a "pacificator," let us hope that it is a "myth," an hippocentaur —a fabulous creature—a kind of Kentucky man—"half a horse and half an alligator."

The next seal which we have selected, is that of *Crediton* school; and worthy it is of the mild climate of Devonshire. The legend, "Sigillum XII. *Gubernatorum bonorum*, Eccles. S. Crucis de Crediton," surrounds a venerable figure, but whether saint or schoolmaster, or both—(if any schoolmaster was ever sainted)*—it is not easy to determine. He is holding forth with his right hand most paternally, and a cap or a glory encircles his temples, while his left hand supports a globe, to intimate perhaps that "the schoolmaster is *abroad*." The date corresponds with the spirit of the seal, 1674.

We consider this to be an illustration of the "reasoning system," which enjoins a master, instead of inflicting corporal punishment upon a boy, to "retire with him for a quarter of an hour and reason with him on the impropriety of his conduct, in not doing his exercise," &c.—a practice which was once seriously recommended by a father to a master of our acquaintance, who had the care of fifty boys in a public school!

We observe, then, the gradual decline (or improvement) of

* St. Dionysius would at first sight answer this hypothesis; but we fear that this saint was the Areopagita.

discipline, which may be traced in the following order:—*The birch in action* (Louth, 1552); *the birch in terrorem* (Bolton, 1566); *the birch on the table* (Oakham, 1584); *the birch under the chair* (St. Saviour's, 1573);* *the little ferule* (Camberwell, 1615); *the hand of admonition*, which the Germans would call "the hand of glory" (Crediton, 1674). Thus we are led on gradually from the age of "terror" to that of "persuasion." Where the "improvement" is to end, we cannot say. Perhaps, however, the original seal of the Birmingham school may suggest an idea. Five individuals—Brummagem all over, "and no mistake"—bare headed, bare armed, and with sleeves tucked up, are sitting before a table, intent upon some game of science: their arms crossed as if feeling for something—may it not be a *pea?* and may not the occupation in which they are engaged be the ancient game of *thimble-rig?* And may not the seal itself be a prophetic representation, after the manner of "*Francis Moore, Physician,*" of the state of discipline in the latter days of grammar schools, when the birch being thrown away, and the cane superseded by "persuasion," and persuasion failing of its anticipated effect, and classics banished—master and boys shall sit down together, and experimentally calculate a problem of chances with three thimbles and a pea? Such seems to be the enigmatical meaning of this curious seal. It is not necessary to suppose that "thimble-rig" shall be the universal game in those days, but simply that the seal is figurative of that mutual confidence which shall then prevail between master and boy—a confidence which may lead to "*thimble-rig*" at Merchant *Tailors':* to "*nitch notch or no notch*" at Eton; to "*humbug how many?*" at the city school; or to any other scientific pastime congenial to the atmosphere of the place in which it is played.

> "Sed quid opus teneras mordaci radere vero
> Auriculas?"

Why should we dwell upon a prospect which cannot but be painful to every real lover of his country—which cannot but be realized if the present folly of "no corporal punishment" be allowed to gain head? With the abolishment of such punishments, either in the army or in schools, all discipline will decline—and, with discipline, scholarship. We are not advocates for torture; but we are strenuously opposed to false principles of humanity, and detest "humbug" in every shape. Therefore is it that we raise our voice against a system of school government

* There is no anachronism in this seal; for St. Saviour's being in the vicinity of London, it would be naturally somewhat in advance of Oakham in "the spirit of the times."

which, sooner or later, must lead to the destruction of all that is sound in literature or manly in feeling. The supposition that a boy's spirit is broken by school discipline, or that a master's heart is hardened by it, is met by the contradiction of a thousand facts. We remember one which, being highly characteristic of both the individuals concerned, we shall relate:—The late Mr. Morgan, of Bath grammar school, was in the annual habit of forbidding squibs, gunpowder, &c., to his boys on the 5th of November, and *invariably* concluded his warning with these words—"*I flogged* SIR SYDNEY SMITH *myself* for this very offence!" Now a kinder hearted man than "Old Morgan," or one more beloved by his boys, could not be found in England; and a braver man than Sir Sydney Smith has never trod the earth! To have flogged such a hero was a pride which the old schoolmaster would scarcely have exchanged for the obsidional crown of Acre: and to have been flogged by one so kind, and yet so just as his master, was, doubtless, of no little use to the future hero himself; who, having learnt the value of discipline betimes, was enabled to control that spirit which, being unchecked, might have been the curse, instead of being, as it became, the glory of his country.

We close our article with a list of the *most eminent men* educated at the grammar schools, and we leave *them* to plead the cause of the seminaries at which they imbibed the first elements of their greatness:—

> "Igneus est ollis vigor et cælestis origo
> Seminibus."

EMINENT MEN EDUCATED AT THE GRAMMAR SCHOOLS OF ENGLAND AND WALES.

The claims of Eton, Winchester, and Westminster, are well known: we shall, therefore, begin with—

Charter House—Isaac Barrow, Sir William Blackstone, Addison, Steele, Chief Justice Ellenborough, &c., and many living scholars of high reputation.

Christ's Hospital—Coleridge (the poet), Bishop Middleton, Jeremiah Markland, Joshua Barnes, Stanley (editor of Æschylus), the Rev. Dr. Richards, &c. and some living Greek scholars of the highest order.

Harrow—Sir William Jones, Sheridan, William Bennet (Bishop of Cloyne), Samuel Parr, LL.D., Lord Byron, &c., and many distinguished noblemen and gentlemen of good family, now living, schoolfellows of *Sir Robert Peel.*

Rugby—Parkhurst (the lexicographer), Bishop Butler (late Head-Master of Shrewsbury), Sir RALPH ABERCROMBIE, &c. Rugby has the credit of having produced the two most successful schoolmasters of the present day—Dr. Butler and Dr. Sleath.

Merchant Taylor's—Bishop Lancelot Andrews and Bishop Giles Thomson (translators of the Bible), Bishop Ezekiel Hopkins, Archbishop Juxon, Archbishop Boulton, Archbishop Sir William Dawes, Bart., Bishop Van Mildert, Edmund Calamy, William Lowth, Charles Wheatley, Shirley (the poet), Edward Bernard (the astronomer), Bulstrode Whitelocke, Robert Lord CLIVE, Sir Samuel Shepherd, &c. Merchant Taylors' has been remarkable for its divines and theologians.

St. Paul's—John Leland, William Camden, John Milton, Sir Samuel Pepys, Sir Thomas Davies (the linguist), Bishop Cumberland, Roger Cotes, John Duke of MARLBOROUGH.

Shrewsbury—Edmund Waring, Wycherley (the poet), Phillips (the poet), John Taylor, LL.D. &c.

Bury St. Edmund's—Archbishop Sancroft, Richard Cumberland, Bishop Tomline, Edward Valentine Blomfield, and the present Bishop of London.

King's School, Canterbury—Edward Lord Thurlow, Herbert Marsh (Bishop of Peterborough), Lord Tenterden.

Exeter—Sir Vicary Gibbs, Stephen Weston, Sir William Follett.

Reading—Archbishop Laud, John Blagrave (the mathematician).

Abingdon—Chief Justice Holt, Archbishop Newcome, Thomas Wintle (translator of Daniel).

Aylesbury—John Wilkes, John Bonnycastle.

Cambridge—Jeremy Taylor.

Wisbeach—Archbishop Herring.

Bodmin—Dean Prideaux.

Truro—Henry Martyn, Lord EXMOUTH, Sir Humphrey Davy.

Derby—John Flamstead, Lord ST. HELENS

Repton—John Lightfoot (the Hebraist).

Barnstaple—Bishop Jewel, John Gay (the poet).

St. Mary Ottery—Judge Buller.

Plympton—Sir Joshua Reynolds.

Totnes—Edward Lye (the Saxon scholar), Benjamin Kennicott (the Hebraist).

Braintree—John Ray.

Watton, Gloucester—Edward Jenner, M.D.

Ashford, Kent—John Wallis (the astronomer).

Maidstone—Bishop Horne, Sir Egerton Brydges.

Bolton-le-Moors—Robert Ainsworth (lexicographer).

Manchester—John Bradford (the martyr), Cyril Jackson.

Rochdale—Thomas Dunham Whittaker, LL.D.

Leicester—W. Cheselden, Richard Farmer (the critic).

Grantham—Sir Isaac Newton, Sir William Cecil, Colley Cibber.

Holbeach—William Stukeley (the antiquary).

Lincoln—Daniel Waterland (the divine).

Stamford—Lord Burleigh.

Mercers' School, London—Dean Colet, Sir Thomas Gresham.

Highgate—Nicholas Rowe (the poet).

Norwich—Archbishop Parker, Archbishop Tenison, Bishop Hoadly,

John Kaye (Founder of Caius College), Sir Edward Coke, Samuel Clarke, D.D. (the commentator).

North Walsingham—Horatio Nelson, Robert Woodhouse, (the mathematician).

Little Walsingham—Sir Henry Spelman.

Newcastle—Nicholas Ridley (Bishop and Martyr), Mark Akenside (the poet), Cuthbert Lord Collingwood, John Earl of Eldon, Sir Wm. Scott, Lord Stowell.

Nottingham—Gilbert Wakefield.

Thame—John Hampden, Antony á Wood, Edward Pococke (the Orientalist).

Uppingham—George Stanhope, D.D. (Dean of Canterbury).

Bridgenorth—Thomas Percy (Bishop of Dromore).

Donnington, Salop—Dr. Douglas (Bishop of Salisbury), Richard Baxter.

Hales Owen—William Shenstone (the poet).

Bath—Sir Sydney Smith, Daniel Lysons, Samuel Lysons, &c.

Bridgewater—Robert Blake (the Admiral).

Basingstoke—Joseph Warton, D.D., Thomas Warton (poet-laureate), Gilbert White (the naturalist).

Southampton—Edward Reynolds (Bishop of Norwich), Isaac Watts, D.D.

Brewood, Staffordshire—Bishop Hurd.

Lichfield—Elias Ashmole (the antiquary), David Garrick, Samuel Johnson, LL.D.

Walsall—John Hough, Bishop of Worcester.

Wolverhampton—Sir William Congreve, Bart.; John Abernethy, (the surgeon).

Guildford—George Abbott, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Kingston, Surrey—Edward Gibbon, afterwards at Westminster for a short time.

Saint Saviour's—Dr. Heberden.

Chichester—John Selden, William Collins (the poet), James Hurdis, D.D., Professor of Poetry at Oxford.

Lewes—John Evelyn.

Coventry—Sir William Dugdale.

Sutton Colefield—Robert Burton (author of the Anatomy of Melancholy), William Burton (the Historian of Leicestershire).

Appleby—John Langhorne, D.D.

Bampton—John Mill, D.D. (the Biblical Critic), Edmund Gibson (Bishop of London.)

Haversham, Westmoreland—Richard Watson, Bishop of Llandaff; Ephraim Chambers (Author of the Dictionary of Arts and Sciences).

Kendal—Thomas Shaw, D.D. (the traveller).

Winton, Westmoreland—Richard Burn, LL.D.

Marlborough—Sir Michael Foster, Sir Thomas Picton.

Salisbury ("The Close" School)—James Harris, Author of Hermes.

York—John Alcock (Bishop of Ely), John Fisher (Bishop of Rochester).

Bradford—John Sharp, Archbishop of York.

Giggleswick—WILLIAM PALEY.
Halifax—John Milner (the divine).
Kingston-upon-Hull—Andrew Marvell (the poet), William Mason (the poet), William Wilberforce.
Leeds—Joseph Milner (the Church historian), Isaac Milner (Dean of Carlisle).
Wakefield—Joseph Bingham (the ecclesiastical antiquary).
Ruthyn—Lord Keeper Williams, Chief Baron Richards, Henry Owen (the divine).
Cowbridge—Sir Leoline Jenkins.

This list is necessarily imperfect, many good names which would do honour to any school having been omitted for want of space; and especially, with one or two remarkable exceptions, the names of living persons, for obvious reasons. But limited as it is, the catalogue exhibits an array of statesmen, philosophers, poets, divines, scholars, and heroes, to which no other country in the world can produce a parallel. That classical schools founded for the purpose of promoting literature and theology should produce the first scholars, historians, poets, and divines, is only what might have been expected of them. And even the discipline of mind which is learned at these seminaries may, in some degree, account for the developement of a NEWTON, a COTES, a FLAMSTEED, a WALLIS, and a DAVY. But how are we to reconcile the prejudice that a *general* must be made at a military college, and a *naval commander* at an establishment where nautical studies alone are pursued, with the FACT, that Eton has produced a WELLINGTON, St. Paul's a MARLBOROUGH, Merchant Taylors' a CLIVE, Rugby an ABERCROMBY, and the grammar school of Marlborough a PICTON? That HORATIO NELSON received the elements of his education at North Walsham school; BLAKE at Bridgewater; COLLINGWOOD at Newcastle; LORD ST. HELENS at Derby; LORD EXMOUTH at Truro; SIR SYDNEY SMITH at Bath? . . We cannot but conclude that the same habits of study and discipline which are necessary to the formation of a *good scholar* are equally desirable to the training of the mind of a hero—that the mimic campaigns of the playground suggested by the stories of *Thebes*, and *Troy*, and *Marathon* have formed the genius which conquered India by CLIVE, or gave peace to Europe through the victories of MARLBOROUGH and of WELLINGTON! And, young as NELSON * must have been when he

* Nelson left school at twelve or thirteen years of age: a period of life when most boys at grammar schools have heard something of ancient history. That he had a *classical mind* is evident from the following passage in his letter to Sir William Hamilton, through whose friendship he had been enabled to provision his fleet at Syracuse in 1798—"Thanks to your exertions we have victualled and watered; and *surely, watering at the fountain of Arethusa, we must have victory.*"

first heard of *Mycale*, of *Salamis*, and of *Actium*, yet who shall say that the influence of these magic names had nothing to do in the creation of the hero of the Nile and Trafalgar?

We urge no further argument for the protection and encouragement of GRAMMAR SCHOOLS—those cradles of our learning, our religion, and our liberties. Every man who loves his country is on our side, for we are on the side of order and of social happiness.

ART. VIII.—1. *First Series. Roman Fallacies and Catholic Truths. To which is prefixed a Narrative of the Conversions effected by St. Mary's Priory, at Princethorpe, during the first five years of its establishment. ..... With an Appendix, containing answers to objections, and the authorities quoted, in the original languages.* By the Rev. H. TOWNSEND POWELL, Vicar of Stretton-on-Dunsmore. London: Painter; Burns. 1841. 12mo.

2. *The Spirit of Popery: An Exposure of its Origin, Character, and Results,—in Letters from a Father to his Children.* London: Religious Tract Society. 1840. 12mo.

3. *The Book of Popery; a Manual for Protestants, descriptive of the Origin, Progress, Doctrines, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Papal Church.* By INGRAM COBBIN, M.A. London: Southgate and Son. 1840. 12mo.

4. *Speech of the* Rev. JOHN CUMMING, A.M., *at the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the British Society for Promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation,* May 21, 1840. London: Robeson, 1840. 8vo.

5. *Doctrine de l'Ecriture Sainte sur l'Adoration de Marie.* Genève. 1822. 8vo.

6. *The Glories of Mary, Mother of God; translated from the Italian of Blessed* ALPHONSUS LIGUORI, *and carefully revised by a Catholic Priest: containing a beautiful paraphrase on the "Salve Regina."* Dublin: Coyne. 1833. 18mo.

7. *The Little Testament of the Holy Virgin: translated from the French, and revised by a Catholic Priest.* Dublin: Coyne. 1836. 48mo.

8. *Month of Mary; or Meditations for each Day of the Month, calculated to inspire Devotion to the Mother of God,*

principally designed for the Month of May. Dublin: Coyne. 1838. 12mo.

9. *The Little Office of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, for the use of the Confraternity of the Scapular, and of other devout Christians, in Latin, and a new English Translation by the Rev.* F. C. HUSENBETH. Third Edition. Norwich: Bacon and Co. London: Keating, 1838. 18mo.
10. *The Catholic School-Book; containing Easy and Familiar Lessons for the Instruction of Youth of both Sexes in the English Language, and in the paths of true Religion and Virtue.* Twentieth edition, with additions. London: Andrews. 1839. 12mo.
11. *The Family Prayer Book; containing all the Public and Private Devotions in use amongst English Catholics.* London: Jones. 1839. 16mo.

OF all the systems of spiritual tyranny ever devised for subjugating the human mind, Popery, or the system of doctrines and practices of the Romish Church, whose head is called the Pope, stands unrivalled and alone for its admirable adaptation to the heart of fallen man. If we examine this complex system, we shall find that every possible temperament has been consulted in it. To those who are fond of pageantry, the Romish Church presents a gorgeous ritual; to the devout and sentimental, she offers incessant prayers, very many of which (as we shall have occasion to show) are clothed in the most impassioned, not to say amatory language. The lovers of music are tempted by compositions the most sublime and beautiful, which can charm or delight the ear; while the admirers of painting and sculpture are fascinated by the most exquisite productions of those arts. In order "to quiet the conscience, it has doctrines of human merit and supererogation; to alarm the indifferent, it has fears of purgatory; to give ease to the conscience of the man of the world and of pleasure, each sin has its indulgence and penance." All men, at times, are under fears of God's wrath; their conscience is touched; they are in anxiety; and at such times popery intervenes, lulls them for the moment, and sends them . . . . . into eternity!

While popery has so many devices for the propagation of the unscriptural and anti-scriptural dogmas and practices, by which the minds of its followers are held in spiritual bondage, it becomes the duty of all who have any regard for the pure and unadulterated truths of the gospel, in defence of which

hundreds of martyrs, in this country alone, perished at the stake, or by other tortures, to defend truth and expose—not revile—error. In this good work "of contending for the faith once delivered to the saints," we rejoice to know that very many are actively engaged: and, in addition to the standard works which from time to time have appeared, we have now to introduce to the notice of our readers various publications, comparatively small in point of size, but which are admirably adapted for usefulness in various situations and circumstances. To these we propose to add some incidental notices of certain popular books of popish devotion, in order that our readers may be put in full possession of the tenets actually held by the Romish Church on one or two points, which some of her advocates have found it convenient to deny or to evade.

"*The Spirit of Popery*" (No. 2 in our list) contains a temperate and well-written exposure of its origin, character, and results, drawn up in a series of letters, addressed by a father to his children. The style of these letters is simple and perspicuous; the matters of fact are well selected; the points of evidence are clearly stated; and it is illustrated by thirteen engravings, which convey to the mind and eye of uninformed readers a good idea of the splendid pageantries of papal Rome. Though chiefly designed for the young, this handsomely printed volume may be read by students of a larger growth; nor do we know a more useful present which can be made to youth, who are about to *visit* countries where popery is dominant, in order to fore-warn them against its seductive witchery.

Mr. Cobbin's "*Book of Popery*" (No. 3) is more historical and miscellaneous than the volume just noticed. It is also very neatly printed; is illustrated with numerous appropriate engravings, exhibiting the spirit and practice of popery; and at the end there is a very useful series of examination-questions for juvenile readers. The chronological table, exhibiting the dates of popish peculiarities in doctrine and practice, and the glossary of Romish ecclesiastical terms, enhance the value of this little volume as a manual for Protestants, who will find in its pages a condensed account of the origin, progress, doctrines, rites, and ceremonies of the papal church, and of the persecutions inflicted by her on those whom she denounces as heretics.

Different in plan and execution, the unassuming little volume of the Rev. H. Townsend Powell, entitled "*Roman Fallacies*," is not less valuable than either of the preceding works for its important exposure of Romish errors; while, having been

printed in the form of tracts, each of which embraces a distinct subject, it is admirably adapted for circulation in parishes or districts where the emissaries of popery are exerting every effort to propagate the dangerous errors of their church. These tracts were first privately printed and distributed by this assiduous and devoted clergyman, in order to defend his parishioners against the insidious attacks of the Romanists, who have a nunnery at Princethorpe, a hamlet in the parish of Stretton. The preface contains a very interesting account of the circumstances which gave rise to the publication of Mr. Powell's tracts in their present form; together with a narrative of the conversions effected by St. Mary's Priory, at Princethorpe, during the first five years of its establishment. This preface demands, and we hope will receive, a very attentive perusal, as exposing the various arts resorted to by papists in order to propagate the peculiar dogmas of the Latin or Romish Church. We rejoice to add that the circulation of Mr. Powell's tracts has been blessed with much success, not only in combating error, but in *securing* his parishioners in their well-founded attachment to the doctrines, ministry, and worship of our Church.

The first series of "Roman Fallacies" comprises ten tracts, which are devoted to the consideration of the idolatry of the Romish Church, viz.—No. I. Angel Worship.—II. Image Worship.—III. Adoration of the Cross.—IV. and V. Relic Worship.—VI. Saint Worship.—VII. Worship of the Virgin Mary.—VIII. Canonization of Saints.—IX. and X. Adoration of the Host. An appendix is subjoined, containing answers to objections, and the authorities quoted are given *in the original languages.* The addition of these authorities, which must have cost the author no small labour and research, greatly enhances the value of Mr. Powell's publication.

As it is an artifice of papists to deny what it is not very agreeable to admit as the actual tenets of their church, the author first proves the existence of the fallacy discussed in each tract by unquestionable evidence, derived from accredited popish books of devotion, or other authoritative sources; he then refutes the fallacy, together with the arguments adduced by his popish opponents, and concludes with some pithy remarks.

The following are his observations on one of the "Priory Tracts" already alluded to, the author of which had boldly protested "that he does not adore images," and had falsely represented the real doctrines put forth by the Romish Church on the adoration and worship of images.

"*The doctrines which issue from St. Mary's Priory, at Princethorpe (which professes to belong to the Church of Rome), compared with the real doctrines of the Church of Rome, as regards the Worship and Adoration of Images, specially images of Christ.*

"ADORATION.

"CHURCH OF ROME.	"ST. MARY'S PRIORY.
"'We ADORE thy Cross, O Lord.' *Roman Missal, p. 197, put forth by command of Pius V. Chief Pontiff, recognised first by the authority of Clement VIII. and again by that of Pope Urban VIII.*	"'I protest that I do NOT ADORE images.'—*Priory Tract, part I. p. 9.*

"WORSHIP.

"CHURCH OF ROME.	"ST. MARY'S PRIORY.
"'It is agreed unanimously, and without contradiction, that it is pleasing and acceptable in the sight of God to worship and salute the representative Images of the dispensation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the undefiled Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary, and of the honourable angels, and of all the saints; *and if any one doth not agree in this, but disputes it, or is indifferent in respect to the worship of the venerable images,* our holy and general Synod ANATHEMATISES HIM.' —*Seventh Action of the Second Nicene Council.*'	"'The Catholic Church declares that Image Worship is one of the greatest crimes.'—*Priory Tract, part I., p. 7.* "'Is it true that we believe that images are to be worshipped, when a General Council of our Bishops, to which, as Catholics, we are bound to submit, tells us they are not to be worshipped?'—*Priory Tract, part I. p. 8.* "'No Catholic believes himself bound to pay any outward signs of respect to images.'—*p. 9.*

"It is impossible not to perceive the striking difference which there is between the real doctrines of the Church of Rome, concerning image worship, and the Priory version of them, when the statements in the Priory Tracts are placed side by side with extracts from the acknowledged authorities of the Church of Rome.

"It needs no depth of sagacity to perceive that the doctrines which issue from the Priory are not what they pretend to be—the doctrines of the Church of Rome, but nothing short of a positive denial of them. The Priory Tract says that 'the Catholic Church declares that image worship is one of the greatest crimes.' But what says the Church of Rome? The Second Council of Nice (which is the very authority referred to by the Priory Tract, page 11), and in the very passage which has been quoted (though not correctly translated) insists upon it, that though the service called 'Latria' ought not to be paid to images, but should be reserved to God alone, an inferior service, called 'proscunesis,' ought to be paid to images. And what is 'proscunesis,' when paid to images, but image worship? 'Proscunesis' is the Greek word used in the Second Council of Nice to express that sort of service which that Council teaches *ought* to be paid to images, and it is this very same word which is constantly translated 'worship' in the English Bible, and 'adoration' in the Douay Testament.

"There is scarcely a less difference (though the difference may not be quite so apparent) between the genuine decree of the Council of Trent and the Priory version of it.

"It is one thing to worship an image of Christ, under the pretext that Christ himself receives the worship which to all outward appearance is paid to the image. It is quite a different thing to make use of a picture, or other likeness of Christ, as a means of teaching this great truth, that the Son of God took upon himself the likeness of men—that so children and ignorant persons may learn that they ought to adore God in the person of Jesus Christ. The former is the doctrine of the Council of Trent—the latter that of St. Mary's Priory."—*Roman Fallacies, No. III.* pp. 7, 8.

Having convicted his Romish antagonist of a wilful misrepresentation of the tenets of the so-called Council of Trent, by contrasting its decree concerning image worship with his own words, Mr. Powell thus continues:

"To interpolate one of the sacred canons of the Council of Trent, must be, in the Church of Rome, a crime of no ordinary magnitude; for these decrees are held to be of equal authority with Holy Scripture by the Church of Rome. What would a Roman Catholic think of a member of the Church of England who, in order to give an apparent sanction to a charge of misrepresentation against a Priest of the Church of Rome, would venture to interpolate the Holy Scripture?

"There seems to be but one satisfactory explanation of this very extraordinary proceeding.

"It was evident that the *real* doctrines of the Church of Rome concerning the worship and adoration of images could not be defended, either from Scripture or the authority of the Catholic Church from the beginning, or the unanimous consent of Fathers; but it would not do for such an establishment as the Princethorpe Priory openly to avow that they were persuaded of this truth. What then was to be done? Deny the doctrines? But then the decree of the Council of Trent would not bear out this denial. Interpolate the decree then? Interpolate the decree!!! It was a desperate resolution to alter one of the sacred canons of a General Council, especially of the Council of Trent; but there was no other alternative. It might, perhaps, escape observation, and then the denial of the doctrine might pass unnoticed; and so there might be some apparent ground for charging a clergyman of the Church of England with misrepresentation and falsehood."—*Ibid. pp.* 9, 10.

Other numbers would furnish appropriate extracts; but we wish to call our readers' attention especially to No. VII., on the Worship of the Virgin Mary, because the author of the popish "Priory Tracts" had unblushingly declared, "We esteem it a most heinous crime to worship the saints"—meaning, by "worship," the giving to another any part of that worship which belongs to God. Mr. Powell derives his evidence chiefly from the two *saints* of the Romish Church, Cardinal Bonaventure and Alphonso Liguori. Our own collections, formed some time since, will enable us to add some additional testimonies which

were not known to him, and thus to establish the fact that divine worship is paid by all Papists to the Blessed Virgin Mary, to whom the present Pontiff, Gregory XVI. has even given the attribute of divine inspiration.

It can scarcely be necessary to apprise our readers, that there is not a single text in the New Testament which affords any pretext whatever in favour of Mary Worship. The anonymous author of the treatise (No. 5) on the Doctrine of Scripture respecting the adoration of Mary, has cited and examined at length every text relating to the Blessed Virgin, and has proved to demonstration that no divine honours are therein permitted to be given to her. It is, indeed, a well-attested fact, that no such honours were given to her before the fourth century. The first persons upon record, as offering divine honours to the Virgin Mary, were the Collyridians, who derived their names from the κολλυριδες, or certain cakes, which they offered annually to Saint Mary, in sacrifice upon her festival, when they worshipped her as a goddess. This superstition came from Thrace, and the yet more distant regions of Scythia and Arabia. While they were mere pagans, they had been accustomed to bake and present similar cakes to the goddess Venus, or Astarte (the moon); and after they professed Christianity, they thought that this honour might now be best shewn to Mary.* This superstition was condemned by Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, and a canonized saint of the Romish church, in as strong terms as if he had foreseen the hyperdulia or transcendent kind of service with which Romanists would one day worship the Virgin Mary. "What scripture," he says, "has delivered anything concerning this? Which of the prophets have permitted a man to be worshipped, that I may not say a woman? For a choice vessel she is, indeed, but yet a woman."....."The body of Mary was holy indeed, but NOT God. The Virgin, indeed, was a virgin and honourable, but not given to us for adoration, but one that did herself worship Him who was born of her in the flesh, and [who] came down from heaven out of the bosom of His Father." After censuring the Collyridians at considerable length, for invoking the Virgin as a goddess, he sums up the whole in the following very emphatic terms: "LET MARY BE IN HONOUR; *but let the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit be worshipped.* LET NO ONE WORSHIP MARY."†

* Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, Cent. iv. Book II. Part ii. ch. v. § 25. (Vol. I. pp. 414, 415, of Dr. Murdock's accurate translation, edited by Mr. Soames.)

† Ἐν τίμῃ ἔστω Μάρια· ὁ δε Πατὴρ, καὶ Υἱὸς, καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, προσκυνεισθω· τὴν Μαρίαν μηδεὶς προσκυνείτω.—*Epiphanius adversus Hœreses, lib. iii. Hær.* 79.

The worship of the Virgin Mary, which had continued to spread between the fourth and ninth centuries, was in the tenth century carried much further than before. Towards its close the custom became prevalent, in the Latin or Western Church, of celebrating masses and abstaining from flesh on Saturdays in honour of Saint Mary. In the next place, the *Daily or Lesser Office of Saint Mary* was introduced, which was subsequently confirmed by Urban II. in the Council of Clermont. And lastly, tolerably distinct traces of the Rosary and Crown of Saint Mary, as they are called, or of praying according to a numerical arrangement, are to be found in this century. The Rosary consists of fifteen paternosters, or repetitions of the Lord's Prayer, and one-hundred-and-fifty ave marias or salutations of the Virgin Mary; and the *Crown of Saint Mary* consists of six or seven repetitions of the Lord's Prayer, and sixty or seventy salutations.* Succeeding ages have witnessed the invention of additional superstitious services in honour of the Blessed Virgin.

We now propose to shew, from the irrefragable evidence of reputed saints and doctors of the Romish Church, as well as from her authorized formularies of public devotion, and from accredited manuals of private devotion, that the worship of the Virgin Mary is taught and enforced by the modern Church of Rome; and the practice of it shall then be demonstrated from the testimonies of modern travellers.

I. Our first class of evidence shall be drawn from the saints and doctors of the Romish Church.

1. We commence with the *Blessed* PETER DAMIAN, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, about the middle of the eleventh century. In his first sermon on the nativity of the Virgin Mary, he thus identifies the Almighty with her. Having asserted that God is (or exists) in all created things in four ways, he says—"In a fourth manner he exists in one creature, viz. the Virgin Mary, by identity; *because he is the same as she is.*"† And in his apostrophe to the Virgin, he actually ascribes *omnipotence* to her: "He that is mighty has done great things in thee; and ALL *power is given unto* THEE *in heaven and on earth.*"‡

2. Saint Bernard was abbot of Clairvaux, in France, at the close of the eleventh and in the former half of the twelfth century: he wrote numerous homilies in honour of the Blessed Virgin, be-

* Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. by Murdock and Soames, vol. ii. p. 299. (Cent. x. part ii. ch. iv. § 3.)

† "Quarto modo inest uni creaturæ, videlicet Mariæ Virgini identitate, *quia idem est quod illa.* Surius, de probatis sanctorum historiis."—*Tom.* v. p. 113.

‡ Fecit in te magna, qui potens est; et *data est* TIBI *omnis potestas in celo* [cœlo] *et in terra,*—*Ibid.* p. 114.

sides making very frequent mention of her in his other writings. Having affirmed that the word *Mary* signifies *Star of the Sea,* and endeavoured to show how appropriate it is to the Virgin, he proceeds thus to exhort his hearers to the worship of her:—

"If the waves of temptation arise, if thou runnest against the rocks of tribulation, look to the star called Mary. If thou art tossed on the waves of pride, ambition, detraction, or emulation, look to the star called Mary. If passion, or avarice, or the allurement of the flesh, toss the little bark of [thy] mind, look to Mary. If disturbed by the heinousness of [thy] crimes, confounded by the filthiness of [thy] conscience, dismayed with horror of judgment, thou beginnest to be swallowed up in the gulf of sorrow, the abyss of despair, think on Mary. In dangers, in difficulties, in doubtful affairs, think on Mary—call upon Mary. Let her not depart from [thy] mouth, let her not depart from [thy] heart; and, in order that thou mayst obtain the suffrage of her prayer, forsake not the example of her conversation. If thou follow her, thou doest not deviate; if thou supplicate her, thou dost not despair; if thou think of her, thou dost not err. If she uphold thee, thou dost not fall; if she protect thee, thou hast no cause for fear; if she be thy leader, thou art not fatigued; if she be propitious, thou obtainest [thy requests]; and thus thou dost experience in thyself how deservedly it is said—*And the name of the Virgin was Mary.*"*

Elsewhere, Bernard terms the Virgin a mediator to the Mediator [Jesus Christ], and adds that there is none more useful to us than Mary;† to whom we are to have recourse as an advocate with Him,‡ and as the woman who was to bruise the serpent's head.§ This application of Gen. iii. 15, to the woman,

---

* "Si insurgant venti tentationum, si incurras scopulos tribulationum, respice stellam, voce Mariam. Si jactaris superbiæ undis, si ambitionis, si detractionis, si æmulationis, respice stellam, voce Mariam. Si iracundia aut avaritia, aut carnis illecebra naviculam concusserit mentis, respice ad Mariam. Si criminum immanitate turbatus, conscientiæ fœditate confusus, judicii horrore perterritus, baratro incipias absorberi tristitiæ, desperationis abysso, cogita Mariam. In periculis, in angustiis, in rebus dubiis, Mariam cogita, Mariam invoca. Non recedat ab ore; non recedat a corde; et, ut impetres ejus orationis suffragium, non deseras conversationis exemplum. Ipsam sequens, non devias: ipsam rogans, non desperas; ipsam cogitans, non erras. Ipsa tenente, non corruis; ipsa protegente, non metuis; ipsa duce, non fatigaris; ipsa propitia, pervenis: et sic in temetipso experiris quam merito dictum sit—'Et Nomen Virginis Mariæ.'"—*Bernardi Opera à Mabillon,* vol. i. col. 748. C. D. Paris, 1690.

† "Opus est enim Mediatore ad Mediatorem istum; nec alter nobis utilior quam Maria."—Col. 1006. E.

‡ "Advocatum vis habere et ad ipsum [Jesum Christum]? Ad Mariam recurre."—Col. 1014. F.

§ "Quam tibi aliam prædixisse Deus videtur, quando ad serpentem ait *Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem.* Et, si adhuc dubitas quod de Maria non dixerit, audi quod sequitur, *Ipsa conteret caput tuum.* Cui hæc servata victoria est, nisi Mariæ, ipsa procul dubio caput contrivit venenatum, quæ omnimodam maligni suggestionem tam de carnis illecebra, quam de mentis superbia, deduxit ad nihilum."—Col. 788. A.

rather than to the seed of the woman—the Lord Jesus Christ—by Bernard (we may incidentally remark), proves how ancient is the corruption, in this passage, of the Latin Vulgate version of the Scriptures which reads ips*a* for ipsE. That this rendering of the Romanists is false, is proved by the evidence of the Septuagint version, the Chaldee paraphrase on the Pentateuch, and by the old Syriac version, all of which refer the pronoun *it* to the seed of the woman and not to the woman herself.* The very ancient manuscript of the Latin Vulgate version in the British Museum, which is acknowledged to be one of the copies of Alcuin's recension of that version, and which was written about the middle of the eighth century, has this corrupt reading, which was most probably introduced in order to support the growing superstition of the age in favour of the Virgin Mary.

3. A similar interpretation of Gen. iii. 15, was written by the *Blessed* ALBERT the Great, Bishop of Ratisbon, about the middle of the thirteenth century, who, in his "Biblia Marialia," affirms that the Virgin Mary is the *Heaven* and the *Light* which the Almighty created, and the *Throne of Mercy* to which the sinner comes for pardon.† The limits necessarily assigned to this article prohibit even the smallest selection of passages from his twelve books in praise of the Virgin Mary, which fill nearly the entire twenty-first volume of the folio edition of his works printed at Lyons in 1651.

4. Saint Bonaventure, Cardinal Bishop of Albano, is accounted one of the most eminent saints of the Romish Church: he lived in the middle and latter part of the thirteenth century. In the fifth lesson of the special service in his honour, appointed for the 14th July (on which day he died in 1474), we are informed that "he wrote many things; in which, combining the greatest learning with ardent piety, he affects the reader while he instructs him."‡ Bonaventure wrote many pieces in honour of the Virgin Mary: particularly "the Praise of the Virgin," "the Psalter of the Virgin," and "the Crown of the Blessed Virgin;"

---

* Bp. Beveridge's Works, vol. ii. p. 193; and vol. ix. pp. 233, 234. 8vo. edit.

† "Gen. i. 1. '*In principio creavit Deus cœlum et terram.*' *Cœlum*, scilicet, empyreum, per quod intelligitur Domina Mundi, Virgo Maria.

"Ipsa etiam dicitur Lux.' Gen. i. *Tenebræ erant super faciem abyssi.* TENEBRÆ ignorantiæ et cæcitatis *super faciem* cordis humani. *Dixitque Deus, Fiat Lux*, id est, Maria generetur et nascatur."—(*Biblia Marialia*, page 1. col. 1. Op. Tom. 21. Lugduni, 1651.)

"Job xxiii. 3. Item ipsa est misericordiæ solium, ad quod veniens peccator, absolvitur. *Quis mihi tribuat ut veniam ad solium ejus?* id est, usque ad Mariam, quæ solium est misericordiæ.—(*Ibid*, p. 12. col. 2.)

‡ "Multa scripsit, in quibus summam eruditionem cum pari pietatis ardore conjungens, lectorem docendo movet."—*Breviarium Romanum*. Pars. Æstiva. p. 485. Edidit F. C. Husenbeth. Norvici. 1830.

besides applying the Te Deum and the Athanasian Creed to her! As the author of "Roman Fallacies" has selected a *few* passages from these various pieces (to which it were not difficult to add others), we shall present some of his quotations to our readers.

1. "Extracts from the 'Praise of the Virgin.'

"'On thee the only hope of all the human race is fixed. Through thee alone the ancient sin of Eve is overcome. Thou art the gate of life to the miserable. Through thee salvation is obtained. He knows not the conscious guilt of sin who devoutly follows thee. It is good then for man to submit himself to thy service, to rule himself by thee in disposing himself to virtue; for thy servants can, through thee, safely ascend to heaven; and, having attained to life, for ever live with thee.....Hail Virgin! end of wrath, purge our faults and grant that when the course of this world is finished, we may not be confounded for our sins.....Hail thou, to whom the Supreme King, that inhabiteth the heavens, hath granted, in perpetual right, to have rule over every creature.'

2. "Extracts from the Psalter of Bonaventure, in which each psalm is made an occasion of honouring the Virgin, by substituting 'Lady' for 'Lord,' in passages which apply to Jehovah and the Messiah. The following are specimens:

"Psalm xxx.—'In Thee, O Lady, have I put my trust, let me never be confounded.'

"Psalm xxxi.—'Into thy hands I commend my spirit, O Lady, for all my life, and to my last day.'

"'Happy are they whose hearts are set upon thee; their sins shall be mercifully blotted out by thee.'

"Psalm xxxvi.—'Glory be to thee for ever, O Queen of Heaven; let us never be forgotten by thee.'

"Psalm cix.—'The Lord said unto our Lady, 'My mother, sit upon my right hand. Goodness and holiness have been thy pleasure; therefore thou shalt reign with me for ever.''

3. "Extract from the 'Crown of the Blessed Virgin.'

"'O thou, our governor and most benignant Lady, in right of being His mother, command your most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he deign to raise our minds from longing after earthly things to the contemplation of heavenly things.'

4. "Extract from a Parody on the Te Deum:

"'We praise thee, the Mother of God; we acknowledge thee to be a virgin. All the earth doth worship thee, the spouse of the Eternal Father. All angels and archangels, all thrones and powers do faithfully serve thee. To thee all angels cry aloud, with a never-ceasing voice, Holy, Holy, Holy, Mary, Mother of God.....The whole court of Heaven doth honour thee as Queen. The Holy Church throughout all the world doth invoke and praise thee, the Mother of Divine Majesty.....Thou sittest with thy Son on the right hand of the Father.....In thee, sweet Mary, is our hope; defend us for evermore. Praise becometh thee; empire becometh thee; virtue and glory be unto thee for ever and ever.'"—*Roman Fallacies, No. VII. pp.* 4-5.

It may strike some unsuspecting reader that, as these passages are quoted from a writer who has been dead nearly seven hundred and ninety years, they must be obsolete, and cannot be the tenets actually held by the Romish Church. Such, however, is not the case. Mr. Cumming produced at the annual meeting, in 1840, of the Society for Promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation, a copy (in Latin) of "*A Tribute*

of Praise to Mary, extracted from the Writings of the Blessed Bonaventure." This treatise was printed at Rome in 1836, with the usual and necessary official imprimatur and re-imprimatur. Without them, indeed, no printer durst have printed the volume, from which Mr. Cumming translated the following passage, which nearly agrees with that before given:

"We praise thee, O Mary, as the mother of God; we acknowledge thee to be our lady. All the earth doth worship thee, august daughter of our everlasting Father. To thee all angels cry aloud, the heavens and all the powers therein; to thee cherubim and seraphim continually do cry, Holy, Holy, Holy art thou, Mary, mother of God. The heavens and earth are full of the majesty of the glory of thy Son! Thou art exalted above the glorious company of the apostles, as the mother of their Creator, as the living temple of the everlasting and glorious Trinity. Holy, Holy, Holy, art thou, O Mary," &c.—*Cumming's Speech*, p. 4.

5. Omitting, for want of space, Bonaventure's Parody on the Athanasian Creed, and his application of it to the Virgin Mary, we now come to another saint of the Romish Church, ALPHONSO LIGUORI, who was canonized, May 26, 1839. His "Glories of Mary" are a paraphrase on the "Salve Regina," in twenty-one meditations, which the translator has dedicated "To Mary, ever Virgin, the most humble and exalted of all pure creatures, the Queen of Angels and of Men, the Mother of God!" "The sacred congregation of rites having made the most rigorous examination of the writings of the saint, to the number of a hundred or more, pronounced that there was nothing in them worthy of censure;" and as "this sentence was approved by Pius VII. in 1803," we conclude that the sentiments of this reputed saint are actually those of the modern Church of Rome. We can only give two or three short extracts from this publication:

"During the pontificate of Gregory the Great, the people of Rome experienced, in a most striking manner, the protection of the Blessed Virgin. A frightful pestilence raged in the city to such an extent that thousands were carried off, and so suddenly, that they had not time to make the least preparation. It could not be arrested by the vows and prayers which the holy Pope caused to be offered in all quarters, until he resolved on having recourse to the Mother of God. Having commanded the clergy and people to go in procession to the Church of our Lady, called St. Mary Major, carrying the picture of the Holy Virgin, painted by St. Luke, the miraculous effects of her intercession were soon experienced; in every street, as they passed, the plague ceased; and before the end of the procession an angel in human form was seen on the tower of Adrian, named ever since the Castle of St. Angelo, sheathing a bloody sabre. At the same moment the angels were heard singing the anthem, 'Regina Cœli,' 'Triumph, O Queen,' &c., and 'Alleluia.' The holy Pope added, 'Ora pro nobis Deum,' pray for, &c., The Church has since used this anthem to salute the Blessed Virgin in Easter time."—*Glories of Mary*, p. 21.

"Albertus Magnus says that Mary was prefigured by Queen Esther: of whom we read in the Holy Scripture, that she had been raised to the throne for the preservation of her brethren, the Jewish people. What Mordecai said to this woman, poor sinners may address to Mary: Imagine not, OMNIPOTENT *and ever glorious Virgin*, that God has elevated you to the dignity of queen, merely for your personal honour and advantage, but rather that you may mediate and obtain pardon for men, your offending brethren: and if Assuerus heard the petition of Esther through love, will not God, who has an infinite love for Mary, fling away at her suit the thunderbolts which he was going to hurl on wretched sinners?.....Will God reject her prayer? Is it not of her it was said 'the law of clemency is on her lips?' Indeed, every petition she offers is as a law emanating from the Lord, by which he obliges himself to be merciful to those for whom she intercedes."—pp. 16, 17.

"Dispensatrix of the divine grace, *you save whom you please*; to you then I commit myself, that the enemy may not destroy me."—p. 100....."We, holy Virgin, *hope for grace and* SALVATION *from you;* and since you need but say the word, ah! do so, *you* SHALL *be heard,* AND WE SHALL BE SAVED."—p. 137.

6. The last passage which we shall adduce from the saints and doctors of the Romish Church, is taken from the encyclical or circular letter addressed by the present pope, Gregory XVI., after his election to the pontificate, "to all patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops;" (by whom it was subsequently communicated to the other members of the Romish Church,) and dated August 15, 1832. This is an authoritative document of the highest importance; because during more than eight years, which have elapsed since it was made public, not one of the ecclesiastics to whom it was addressed has protested or reclaimed against it. And when the patriarchs, primates, and other dignitaries of the Romish Church, tacitly assent to any letter or decree of the Pope, it becomes "judicium irreformabile," and is admitted to contain the doctrine actually held by that Church.* The following passages are taken from the version of this encyclical letter, published in the "Laity's Directory" for the year 1833. Having referred to the circumstances which had delayed the issuing of this letter, Gregory XVI. thus proceeds:—

"But having at length taken possession of Our see in the Lateran Basilica, according to the custom and institution of Our predecessors, We turn to you without delay, Venerable Brethren; and in testimony of Our feeling towards you, We select for the date of Our letter this most joyful day on which We celebrate the solemn festival of the Most Blessed Virgin's triumphant Assumption into Heaven; that She, who has been through every great calamity Our Patroness and Protectress, may watch over Us, writing to you [literally 'may stand over Us propitious,' '*nobis adstet propitia*'], and lead Our mind by her

* Delahogue de Ecclesia, p. 152. edit. 1829.

Heavenly influence [literally 'by her Heavenly inspiration,' '*cœlesti afflatu suo*'] to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock." (*Laity's Directory*, 1833. p. 2.)

What notion (we would ask) are we to form, after reading this paragraph, of the veracity of those Romanists who cease not, after Bossuet, to affirm, when praying to the saints (including of course the Holy Virgin), "We only *pray to them to pray for us;* that is, the petitioners? Here is the acknowledged head of their religion performing a solemn act of worship to the deified Mary, on a day dedicated to her *presumed* assumption, invoking her as his "patroness and protectress," particularly in time of great need or calamity, and intreating her "*by her heavenly inspiration*" to lead his mind into what he thought "salutary for Christ's flock!!!" Is this only to pray to her to pray for him?

At the close of his letter, Gregory XVI. thus expresses himself:—

"But that all" [these events, *omnia hæc*] "may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise Our eyes" [and hands, *oculos manusque*] "to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope" [literally, "confidence," *fiducia*], "yea the entire ground of our hope. May she exert her patronage to draw down an efficacious blessing on our desires, our plans and proceedings, in the present straitened condition of the Lord's flock." (*Ibid.* pp. 14, 15.)

In the two preceding quotations from the Pope's encyclical letter, we have the authorized Popery of the nineteenth century, as exhibited by the Pontiff himself, and reviving in all its offensiveness the Collyridian Heresy, which Epiphanius justly stigmatized as βλασφημον πραγμα—*a blasphemous thing.*

Before we proceed to produce further evidence of the idolatrous worship of the Virgin Mary in and by the Church of Rome, it may be well to pause a little, and reflect upon the quotations above given. By contrasting them with the divinely inspired Scriptures, it will be evident that part of the honour which belongs only to Almighty God, is therein actually attributed to the Virgin Mary: and here we shall chiefly avail ourselves of the powerful and conclusive deductions of the author of "Roman Fallacies:"—

1. "Attributes and titles of the FIRST PERSON in the ever-blessed Trinity assigned to the Virgin Mary:

"CO-EXISTENCE FROM EVERLASTING WITH THE FATHER.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.	THE CHURCH OF ROME.
"To us there is BUT ONE GOD THE FATHER, OF WHOM ARE ALL THINGS, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him."—1 *Cor.* viii. 6.	"The Holy Church throughout all the world doth invoke and praise thee, THE MOTHER OF DIVINE MAJESTY"—*Parody on the "Te Deum," by Bonaventure.*

"The title, 'Mother of Divine Majesty,' addressed to the Virgin Mary, directly asserts her to be a Divine Person or Goddess; and when it is remembered that this title is a parody upon the expression, 'Father of an infinite Majesty,' it implies that the Virgin Mary is, if not in glory equal, at least of majesty co-eternal with the Father:

"PARENTAL AUTHORITY OVER GOD THE SON.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.

"God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus EVERY KNEE SHOULD BOW OF THINGS IN HEAVEN, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."—*Phil.* ii. 9, 10.

THE CHURCH OF ROME.

"O, then our Governor and most benignant Lady, in right of being his mother, COMMAND your most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he deign to raise our minds from longing after earthly things to the contemplation of heavenly things."—*Crown of the Blessed Virgin, by Bonaventure.*

2. "Attributes and titles of the SECOND PERSON of the ever-blessed Trinity assigned to the Virgin Mary:

"OUR HOPE.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.

"Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the commandment of God our Saviour and Lord Jesus Christ, which is OUR HOPE."—1 *Tim.* i. 1.

"(Jesus Christ) was manifest in these last times for you; who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory, that *your faith and* HOPE *might be in* GOD."—1 *Pet.* i. 21.

THE CHURCH OF ROME.

"On thee THE ONLY HOPE of all the human race is fixed."—*Bonaventure, Praise of the Virgin.*

"That all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our GREATEST HOPE, yea THE ONLY GROUND OF OUR HOPE."—*Pope Gregory XVI., Encyclical Letter. Laity's Directory for* 1833.

"THE ENTRANCE TO ETERNAL LIFE.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.

"I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved."—*St. John* x. 9.

THE CHURCH OF ROME.

"Thou (O Virgin Mary) art the gate of life."—*Praise of the Virgin.*

"THE AUTHOR OF ETERNAL LIFE.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.

"Being made perfect, he (Jesus Christ) became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey HIM."—*Heb.* v. 9.

THE CHURCH OF ROME.

"It is good for a man to submit himself to thy service (O Virgin Mary), to rule himself by thee in disposing himself to virtue; for thy servants can through thee safely ascend to heaven, and having attained to life, for ever live with thee."—*Praise of the Virgin.*

"THE AUTHOR OF SALVATION.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.

"Neither is there salvation in any other (than Jesus Christ), for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."—*Acts* iv. 12.

THE CHURCH OF ROME.

"Through thee (O Virgin Mary) salvation is obtained."—*Praise of the Virgin*

"THE CONQUEROR OF ADAM'S SIN.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.

"As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."—1 *Cor.* xv. 22.

THE CHURCH OF ROME.

"Through thee alone (O Virgin Mary) is the ancient sin of Eve overcome."—*Praise of the Virgin.*

"THE PURGER OF SINS.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.	THE CHURCH OF ROME.
"Who (Jesus Christ), when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."—*Heb.* i. 3.	"Hail Virgin! end of wrath, purge our faults, and grant that when the course of this world is finished, we may not be confounded for our sins."—*Praise of the Virgin.*

"THE RULER OVER EVERY CREATURE.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.	THE CHURCH OF ROME.
"He (the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory) raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and name that is named, not only in this world but also that which is to come, and *hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the Head over all things to the Church.*"—*Eph.* i. 20.	"Hail thou, to whom the Supreme King that inhabiteth the heavens hath granted in perpetual right to have rule over every creature."—*Praise of the Virgin.*

"THE MESSIAH PROPHESIED OF BY DAVID.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.	THE CHURCH OF ROME
"The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool."—*Ps.* cx. 1.	"The Lord said unto our Lady, My Mother, sit upon my right hand."—*Ps.* 109. *Bon: Psalter.*

"This text of the holy Psalmist is cited by Jesus Christ as a prophecy of Christ (St. Matt. xxii. 41): 'While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They say unto him, the son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord? saying, the Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool. If David, then, call him Lord, how is he his Son?'

3. "Attributes and titles of the THIRD PERSON of the blessed Trinity addressed to the Virgin Mary:

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.	THE CHURCH OF ROME
"When he the Spirit of truth is come, he shall guide you into all truth."—*St. John* xvi. 13. "As many as are *led by the Spirit of God*, they are the sons of God."—*Rom.* viii. 14.	"That she (the Virgin Mary) may watch over us writing to you, and *lead our mind by her heavenly influence* [literally, "heavenly inspiration"] to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock."—*Pope Gregory, Enc. Letter.*

Here, if words have any meaning, Gregory XVI. attributes inspiration to the Virgin Mary. He speaks not of her as the *channel*, but as the FOUNTAIN of Grace; and he puts her in the place, not of the Lord Jesus Christ, the "one Mediator between God and man," (1 Tim. ii. 5); but of the Holy Spirit himself. "In short, in this monstrous passage, THE POPE HAS SET UP ANOTHER GOD."*

4. "The praise of Jehovah applied to the Virgin Mary:

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.	THE CHURCH OF ROME.
"In thee, O Lord, do I put my trust, let me never be ashamed."—*Ps.* xxxi. 1.	"In thee, O Lady, have I put my trust, let me never be confounded."—*Ps.* xxx. *Bonaventure's Psalter.*

* Golightly's "Look at Home, or Short and Easy Method with the Roman Catholics," page 8. Oxford. 1837.

"Into thy hands I commend my spirit, for thou hast redeemed me, O LORD God of truth."—*Ps.* xxx. 5.	"Into thy hands I commend my spirit, O Lady, for all my life, and to my last day."—*Ps.* xxx. *Bonav.*

5. "The praise of the ever-blessed Trinity addressed to the Virgin Mary:

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.	THE CHURCH OF ROME.
"Who shall not fear thee, O Lord and glorify thy name, for thou ONLY art holy?"—*Rev.* xv. 4. "They rest not day or night, saying, Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come."—*Rev.* iv. 8.	'Holy, holy, holy Mother of God."—*Bonav. Parody on the Te Deum.*

6. "The Virgin Mary said to be a more powerful intercessor than Jesus Christ:

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.	THE CHURCH OF ROME
"He (Jesus Christ) is able to save them to the uttermost, who come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."—*Heb.* vii. 25.	"The pestilence could not be arrested by the vows and prayers which the holy Pope caused to be offered in all quarters, until he resolved on having recourse to the Mother of God..... the miraculous effects of her intercession were soon experienced."—*Glories of Mary, Liguori. Rom. Fall.* pp. 8, 10.

7. "OMNIPOTENCE ascribed to the Virgin Mary:

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.	THE CHURCH OF ROME
"All power (said Jesus Christ) is given unto ME in heaven, and in earth."—*Matt.* xxviii. 18.	"All power is given unto THEE (The Blessed Virgin) in heaven and on earth."—*Saint Peter Damian.* "OMNIPOTENT and ever glorious Virgin." *Blessed Albert the Great,* as cited by *Saint Liguori.*

If any candid Romanist should cast his eye over the preceding quotations, we think that he must be constrained to admit that not only some, but even a great part, of that honour which belongs only to God is assigned to the Virgin Mary.

II. But from the testimonies of the saints and doctors of the Romish Church, let us advance to her authorized public formularies, which will furnish us with equal—if not stronger—evidence that the Virgin Mary *is* actually worshipped by members of that Church.

Five solemn festivals are annually celebrated in honour of the Virgin Mary, viz. Her Conception, Dec. 8; Nativity, Sept. 8; Annunciation, March 25; and Assumption, August 15. But the Annunciation and Purification do not so properly relate to her as to Jesus Christ. The former is the Annunciation *to* (not of) the Virgin Mary, by the ministry of an angel, of the Incarnation of the Son of God, who was to be born of her; and this is the view taken of that festival in the Collect of our Church appointed for that day; the Purification should rather be (as it is termed in our Liturgy), "the Presentation of Christ in the Temple;" and to this fact in the life of our Redeemer our attention is also directed in the Collect for the day, which,

at the time of the Reformation (as *now*, in popish countries), was "commonly" (however erroneously) "called, the Purification of Saint Mary the Virgin." There remain, then, three festivals by the Romish Church exclusively dedicated to the Virgin, viz. her supposed Immaculate Conception, her Nativity, and her pretended Assumption into heaven. A few extracts, out of many, shall be given from the offices appropriated to these festivals.

1. The festival of the CONCEPTION is celebrated on the 8th of December. The doctrine of *the immaculate conception* of the Virgin Mary was invented by certain canons of Laon in the year 1140; and the festival instituted in honour of it met with strong opposition not only from Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, but also from other distinguished writers of the twelfth century. In the thirteenth century, the festival became gradually more common: though all the schoolmen of any distinction continued to reject this doctrine, Having been condemned by Thomas Aquinas, it would have been for ever put to rest, but for Duns Scotus, who opposed the Dominican saint, and who was the first of the schoolmen that ventured to defend it. Thenceforward it became one of the most important controversies between the Franciscans and Dominicans. Mutual recriminations of heresy and sacrilege were thrown out against each other: cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and universities were for a long time embroiled in goodly hostility, in discussing the knotty point concerning the immaculate conception of the Virgin, by which she was declared to be free from the taint of original sin. Pope Sixtus IV. made several attempts to decide the question, which were frustrated. In refutation of this absurd tenet, it is sufficient to cite the words of the Virgin herself in Luke i. 48: "My spirit hath rejoiced in God MY Saviour." If she had been without taint of sin, why should she have spoken, or felt her need, of a Saviour from sin? Not to detail subsequent disputes on this subject, we may briefly state that the doctrine itself was decreed by the Council of Basil in the fifteenth century, when the festival was instituted;* that Sixtus IV., in 1476, terminated the difference by leaving every one free as to this much litigated question, whose determination was adopted by the assembly of Romish divines convened at Trent in the sixteenth century; and that Alexander VII. in 1661, renewed all the decrees in favour of those who defended the doctrine of the immaculate conception. We now proceed to a few extracts from the formularies of the Romish Church.

Although the word "immaculate" is not used in the Roman

* Gieseler's Text Book of Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. pp. 342-346. Murdock's Translation of Mosheim, vol. ii. p. 493, and vol. iv. p. 138. Spanheim's Ecclesiastical Annals, by Wright, p. 501, second edition.

Breviary in the festival of the CONCEPTION, yet the whole service is full of highly laudatory expressions in honour of the Virgin, which cannot be acquitted of the charge of profaneness.* In the verse selected from the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus (xxiv. 15), for instance, (which the Romish Church has pronounced to be a canonical book, in opposition to the concurrent voice of the Universal Church, and which is applied to the Virgin Mary,) the incommunicable attribute of eternity is given to her, who was one of Adam's fallen race, and who must have been the partaker of sins and infirmities, in which all, so descended, deeply share :—

"Ab initio et ante sæcula creata sum, et usque ad futurum sæculum non desinam."*	"From the beginning, and before the world was, I existed; and unto the world to come I shall not cease to be."—*Anglo-Romish Version.* Dublin. 1825.

In the hymn, "Salve Regina," which is always used on this festival, as well as on that of the Nativity of the Virgin, the "Star of the Sea, Sweet Mother of God, and ever Virgin," and "the Blessed Gate of Heaven," is thus invocated :†

"Solve vincla reis,	"Loosen the chains of the guilty,
Profer lumen cæcis,	Present light to the blind,
Mala nostra pelle,	Drive away our evils,
Bona cuncta posce.	And ask for us all good things.
Monstra te esse matrem,	Shew that you are a mother,
Sumat per te preces,	Let Him who was born for us
Qui pro nobis natus,	And condescended to be thine,
Tulit esse tuus.	Receive through thee our prayers.
Virgo singularis,	O singular Virgin,
Inter omnes mitis,	Meek above all others,
Nos culpis solutos,	Make us, released from our sins,
Mites fac et castos.	Meek and chaste.
Vitam præsta puram,	Grant us a pure life,
Iter para tutum,	Prepare for us a safe journey,
Ut videntes Jesum	That beholding Jesus,
Semper collætemur."	We may ever rejoice together."

This well-known hymn also forms part of the "Office of the Virgin Mary," which is asserted, in the "Short Exposition" prefixed to a copy now before us, to be "of great antiquity," and to have been "composed by the Church, directed by the Holy Ghost!" But "The Little Office of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary," (No. 9. on our list) contains, if possible, still stronger idolatrous devotions. Yet to this publication the late titular Bishop of Castabala (Dr. John Milner), on the 21st Nov. 1822, prefixed his formal approbation, stating that he had "found nothing in either of them" [the Latin

* Husenbeth's edition of the Breviarium Romanum, Pars Hiemalis, p. 440.
† Ibid. p. cxliv.

original and Mr. Husenbeth's translation] "contrary to the faith of the Church, or to the belief of its most learned and pious doctors." We give one prayer from this "Little Office."

"Sancta Maria, regina cælorum, mater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et mundi domina, quæ nullum relinquis, et nullum despicis, respice me domina clementer oculo pietatis, et impetra mihi apud tuum dilectum Filium, cunctorum veniam peccatorum: ut qui nunc tuam sanctam et immaculatam Conceptionem devoto affectu recolo, æternæ in futurum beatitudinis bravium capiam, ipso, quem virgo peperisti, donante Domino nostro Jesu Christo, qui cum Patre, et Sancto-Spiritu, vivit et regnat in Trinitate perfecta Deus in sæcula sæculorum." (p. 10.)

"Holy Mary, Queen of heaven, mother of our Lord Jesus Christ and mistress of the world, who forsake no one and despise none, look upon me mercifully with your pious eyes, and obtain for me of your beloved Son, the pardon of all my sins; that as I now celebrate with devout affection your holy and immaculate Conception, I may obtain hereafter the prize of eternal happiness, by the grace of Him whom you, a virgin, brought forth, our Lord Jesus Christ, who lives and reigns one God, in perfect Trinity, world without end." (p. 11.)

The following are a few passages from the hymns interspersed through this manual "for the use of the Confraternity of the Scapular."*

* A SCAPULAR, or "SCAPULARY," is a piece of stuff with these letters, I.H.S. on one side, and two hearts on the other. They are the three first Greek letters of the name of Jesus, ΙΗΣουϛ. The devil fears much this terrible weapon, the institution of which was by a great saint, who saw the Virgin Mary in his sleep—(fit time for such a vision). She appeared holding a scapulary, and commanded him to make use of it. Its diffusion was prodigious, and there are few true Catholics, especially among women, who do not wear round their necks this spiritual collar. In many churches the statues of the infant Jesus and of the holy Virgin have each a scapulary hanging round their necks. During the whole time I was a fervent Catholic I wore one very devoutly, and I believed it had a great part in my spiritual victories. Immense indulgences are attached to it; wonderful miracles are attributed to its mediation. It is not possible to be damned with a scapulary round one's neck; the devil has no power on a man *scapularised;* death itself respects him. 'A pious officer,' says the book written upon this subject, 'received in a battle a ball, which was flattened against this best cuirass, and fell at his feet.' 'Another man,' says the same book, 'being drunk, fell into a river, and was prevented from drowning by the scapulary, which kept him afloat for a whole night, till some fishermen, seeing him in the morning, saved him, wondering at such a miracle.' The Gospel is not more firmly believed than these tales: I believed them myself, I must avow it."—(*Confessions of a French Catholic Priest, edited by S. F. B. Morse, pp.* 178-179. Dublin, 1838. 12mo.)—A copious statement of all the marvellous privileges and virtues attached to the scapular, is given in "A brief Account of the Indulgences, Privileges, and Favors conferred on the Order, Confraternities, and Churches of the most glorious Mother of God, the Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel; with distinct instruction for the brothers and sisters of the Sacred Scapular, and for all the faithful who visit the churches of the said Order. Translated from the Italian and Spanish languages by Thomas Coleman, Provincial of the Cal. [*i.e. Calceated*], Carmelites in Ireland, &c. Dublin: Printed for the Confraternity of the Holy Scapular, held in the Convent of Whitefriars, 75, Aungier Street, 1826." 8vo.—The CONFRATERNITIES OF THE SCAPULAR are associations of persons wearing it in honour of the Virgin.

" Eia mea labia annuntiate ; Laudes et præconia Virginis immaculatæ. Domina in adjutorium meum intende ; Me de manu hostium potenter defende."	" Sing, O my lips, and joyfully proclaim The spotless virgin's praise and glorious name. O Lady pure! extend your gracious aid ; Guard me from all my foes, O spotless Maid!"
" Te pulchram ornavit Sibi sponsam, quæ in Adam non peccavit."	" Thee he adorned his spouse, and made thee free From that foul stain of Adam's progeny !"
" Salve Virgo puerpera Templum Trinitatis !"	" Hail Virgin, Mother of our gracious Lord ! Bright Temple of the Trinity adored."
" Per te Mater gratiæ, Dulcis spes reorum, Fulgens stella maris, Portus naufragorum : Patens cœli janua Salus infirmorum, Videamus Regem, In aulâ sanctorum."	" Mother of grace ! sweet hope is found in thee ; Heaven, at thy prayer, will set the guilty free : The ocean's guiding star, serenely bright, The port that gladdens the wrecked seaman's sight : Through thee, the opened gate, the weak one's aid, May we heaven's King behold, and saints be made."
" Domina protege orationem meam: Et clamor meus ad te veniat."	" O Lady, protect my prayer : And let my cry come to you."
" COMMENDATIO. " Supplices offerimus, Tibi Virgo pia, Hæc laudum præconia : Fac nos ut in via, Ducas cursu prospero, Et in agonia Tu nobis assiste O dulcis Maria. Deo gratias." (*Officium Parvum Immaculatæ Conceptionis*, pp. 8, 10, 18, 30, 32.)	" THE COMMENDATION. " O Virgin pure ! to thee our hands we raise, And suppliant offer thee these hymns of praise : O guard us safely in our dubious way, Lead us secure to heaven's eternal day ; And in the last and awful hour of death, Sweet Virgin Queen, receive our parting breath. Thanks be to God." (*Little Office*, pp. 9, 11, 19, 31, 33.)

The following portion of a long prayer, which is offered directly to the Virgin Mary, by the members of the confraternities of the Scapularians in Ireland, is not inferior, in the idolatry of its expression, to any of those already given:

"O! Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel, dearest Mother of God, Queen of Angels, Advocate of Sinners, Comforter of the Afflicted, extend, O glorious Virgin! the ear of your pity to the prayers of me, your most humble servant; and grant me by your grace to be in the number of those whom you love and keep inscribed on your virginal bosom. Purify my heart, O immaculate Virgin! from every sin; take away and banish from me all, every thing, that can offend your chaste eyes; purge this soul from its affection for earthly and sinful goods, and raise it to the love of everlasting and celestial blessings, and cause that this may be my whole study and diligence. Pray to your Son, O holy Virgin! for me, now, always, and at the hour of my death, and in that tremendous and awful day of judgment; and when I shall be obliged to render an account of my actions, that by your means I may be able to escape the eternal flames. Do not withdraw yourself from me, O Blessed Virgin!"*

Before we proceed to other festivals in honour of the Virgin, we will just add, as illustrative of the real sentiments actually held by the present head of the Romish Church, that in the course of the year 1840, Gregory XVI. granted an indulgence of one hundred years to every one who shall recite the following prayer:

"O IMMACULATE QUEEN OF HEAVEN AND OF ANGELS! I ADORE YOU. IT IS YOU WHO HAVE DELIVERED ME FROM HELL. IT IS YOU FROM WHOM I LOOK FOR ALL MY SALVATION"!!!†

The quotation already given, in p. 174, from Bernard of Clairvaux, also forms part of the service for the festival of the NATIVITY of the Virgin, from which we have only room for the following brief extract:

"Beata es, O Virgo Maria, quæ Dominum portasti Creatorem mundi. Genuisti qui te fecit, et in æternum permanes Virgo."	"Blessed art thou, O Virgin Mary, who hast borne the Lord, the Creator of the World. Thou hast brought forth [him] who made thee, and thou remainest a virgin for ever."—(*Breviarium Romanum*, Pars Autumnalis, p. 316.)

* Coleman's Brief Account of the Indulgences, &c. page 57. (The title is given at length in the note to page 185.)

† *Extract of a private letter from Italy in Archives du Christianisme, No.* 15. 8 A . 1840. p. 122. "J'ai lu dans l'Église des Jesuites que le pape a accordé cent années d'indulgences á celui qui recitera la Prière qui suit: 'Vierge immaculée, Reine du ciel et des anges, je vous adore. C'est vous qui m'avez delivré d'enfer. C'est de vous que j'attends mon salut (tutta la mia salute).'" The writer adds, "that he heard a preacher in the Church of Saint Louis at Rome, who had the audacity to assert that the kingdom of heaven was divided into two, immediately after Jesus Christ had said upon the Cross, 'It is finished!' The kingdom of justice fell to Jesus Christ, who is only a severe judge; and the *kingdom of mercy fell to Mary, who alone can open to us the gate of heaven!*"—(pp. 121, 122.)

But the festival of the ASSUMPTION of the Virgin Mary, both body and soul, into heaven (and a precious assumption it is), is that, in which the Romish Church seems most to exalt, to the rank of Deity, an eminently holy woman, but one, nevertheless, who had been born in sin like other mortals. Not only is her assumption paralleled with the ascension of our adorable Redeemer, but her body is said, like that of Jesus Christ, to have been miraculously preserved from corruption. It can scarcely be necessary to apprise our readers that "the story of the assumption" is one of those tales which rests upon the authority of the Church of Rome. It is wanting in evidence to render it credible to those who do not receive that authority as infallible. The last we hear about the Virgin Mary, in Scripture, is in Acts i. 14, where it is said, "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and with MARY, THE MOTHER OF JESUS, and with his brethren."* In vain shall we seek for evidence of this assumption in the apostolical fathers, or in the writings of the ecclesiastical authors who succeeded them. In vain shall we search the pages of history for its origin. The most ancient martyrologies speak of it with great reserve, as an event not fully ascertained: nor can the festival itself be traced higher than the fourth century at Rome, and the eighth or ninth in Germany and Gaul or France. By the Greek Church it seems to have been adopted about the sixth century.

The "Office of the Assumption" in the Breviary, contains the following, among other extraordinary assertions:—

"Assumpta est Maria in cœlum: gaudent angeli; laudantes benedicunt Dominum."

"Mary is taken up into heaven; the angels rejoice; praising, they bless the Lord."

"Venite adoremus Regem Regum: cujus hodie ad æthereum Virgo mater assumpta est cœlum."

"Come let us adore the King of kings: whose Virgin Mother is this day taken up to the æthereal heaven."

"Exaltata est sancta Dei genitrix super choros angelorum ad cœlestia regna."

"The Holy Mother of God is exalted to the heavenly realms above the choirs of angels."

"Paradisæ [Paradisi] portæ per te nobis apertæ sunt, quæ hodie gloriosa [gloriose?] cum angelis triumphas."

"The gates of Paradise are opened unto us by thee, who dost this day gloriously triumph with the angels."—*Breviarium. Pars Æstivalis.* pp. 595, 597, 598.

"Maria Virgo assumpta est ad æthereum thalamum, in quo Rex regum stellato sedet solio."

"The Virgin Mary is taken up to the ethereal bride-chamber, where the King of kings sitteth on a starry throne."—*Ibid.* p. 607.

Omitting the lessons from *Saint* John of Damascus and

* Roman Fallacies, No. VII. p. 7.

others for the festival of this imaginary assumption, we shall now present our readers with one or two passages illustrative of the doctrines which are inculcated on the children of Romanists in this country. "The Catholic School-Book" (No. 10 in our list) was also introduced under the approbation of the titular Bishop of Castabala, Dr. Milner, in 1818, as being, in his opinion, "eminently entitled to the patronage of the Catholic public." ..... "As such," he added, he should "not fail to recommend it in those places of education in which he had any authority or influence." The following passages will shew what profound reverence and affection the young mind is taught to entertain and cherish for the Virgin:

"Next to God, and the most adorable humanity of his Son Jesus Christ, it is she whom we must chiefly honour and love, by reason of that most sublime and excellent dignity of Mother of God, which raises her above all creatures which God has ever created.

"By her we may receive all the assistance which is necessary for us. SHE IS MOST POWERFUL WITH GOD, TO OBTAIN FROM HIM ALL THAT SHE SHALL ASK OF HIM. SHE IS ALL GOODNESS IN REGARD OF US, BY APPLYING TO GOD FOR US. BEING MOTHER OF GOD, HE CANNOT REFUSE HER REQUEST: BEING OUR MOTHER, SHE CANNOT DENY US HER INTERCESSION WHEN WE HAVE RECOURSE TO HER. OUR MISERIES MOVE HER, OUR NECESSITIES URGE HER; THE PRAYERS WE OFFER HER FOR OUR SALVATION BRING TO US ALL THAT WE DESIRE: AND ST. BERNARD IS NOT AFRAID TO SAY, 'THAT NEVER ANY PERSON INVOKED THAT MOTHER OF MERCY IN HIS NECESSITIES, WHO HAS NOT BEEN SENSIBLE OF THE EFFECTS OF HER ASSISTANCE.'" (*Catholic School-Book*, p. 158.)

"If you will be a true child, and a sincere servant of the Blessed Virgin, you must be careful to perform four things:—

"1. Have a great apprehension of displeasing her by mortal sin, and of afflicting her motherly heart by dishonouring her Son, and destroying your soul; and if you chance to fall into that misfortune, have recourse readily to her, that she may be your intercessor in reconciling you to her Son, whom you have extremely provoked. 'She is the refuge of sinners as well as of the just, on condition they have recourse to her with a true desire of converting themselves,' as St. Bernard says. 2. Love and imitate her virtues, principally her humility and chastity. These two virtues among others rendered her most pleasing to God; she loves them particularly in children, and is pleased to assist with her prayers, those whom she finds particularly inclined to those virtues, according to the same saint. 3. Have recourse to her in all your spiritual necessities: and for that end offer to her daily some particular prayers; say your beads, or the Little Office, sometimes in the week; perform something in her honour on every Saturday, whether prayer, abstinence, or alms; honour particularly her feasts by confession and communion. 4. Be mindful to invoke her in temptations, and in the dangers you find yourself in of offending God. You

cannot shew your respect better than by applying yourself to her in these urgent necessities, and you can find no succour more ready and favourable than hers.

"If you perform this, you will have a true devotion to the Blessed Virgin, YOU WILL BE OF THE NUMBER OF HER REAL CHILDREN, AND SHE WILL BE YOUR MOTHER, UNDER WHOSE PROTECTION YOU SHALL NEVER PERISH." (*Ibid*, pp. 159-161.)

Omitting the well-known "Litany of Loretto,"* which is found in almost every popular manual of popish devotion, as well as in the Breviary, and also the blasphemous prayers addressed to the Virgin Mary in the "Devotion of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, including the devotion to the Sacred Heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary," which were fully exposed by the Bishop of Exeter,† some years since; we shall now add a few prayers directly addressed to the Virgin from recent popular manuals of popish devotion:

"The Prayer of St. Bernard:—Remember, O most holy Virgin Mary! that no one ever had recourse to your protection, implored your help, or sought your mediation, without obtaining relief. Confiding, therefore, in your goodness, behold me, a penitent sinner, sighing out my sins before you, beseeching you to adopt me for your son, and to take upon you the care of my eternal salvation.

"Despise not, O Mother of Jesus! the petition of your humble client, but hear and grant my prayer." (*Family Prayer Book*, p. 151. No. 11 in our list.‡)

"O merciful Virgin! who, next to Jesus, art my hope and life, obtain for me perseverance in the service of God, and the happiness of seeing Jesus thy son at the end of my exile." (*Imitation of the Blessed Virgin*, p. 316.)§

"Mother of my Redeemer, O Mary, in the last moments of my life, I implore thy assistance with more earnestness than ever. I find myself, as it were, placed between hell and heaven. Alas! what will

---

* "Pope Sixtus V., June 11, 1587, granted to all Christians an indulgence of two hundred days each time, for piously reciting the Litany of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which indulgence was confirmed by Benedict XIII., January 20, 1728." (*Family Prayer Book*, p. 148.)

† Philpotts's Supplemental Letter to Charles Butler, Esq. pp. 10-17. 1826.

‡ The Romish "Family Prayer Book" above cited, is dedicated to his "Lordship," Peter Augustine Baines, titular Bishop of Liga, who has prefixed his approbation to it, in which he states that he has read the book, and does "not find any thing in it repugnant to the faith, morality, and discipline of the Catholic Church."

§ "The Imitation of the Blessed Virgin, composed on the plan of the Imitation of Christ:" from the French. London: Keating, Brown, and Keating. 1818. 18mo. We suppose that this treatise is a translation of the anonymous "l'Imitation de la très-sainte Vierge sur le modèle de l'Imitation de Jesus Christ, par M. l'Abbé * * *" [Herouville, according to Barbier, Dict. des Anonymes, tom. ii. p. 163.] It was published at Paris in 1768, and has passed through very numerous editions. There was another treatise, "De l'Imitation de la Vierge, translated from the Spanish of Francesco Arias, by M. de Courbeville." It was also published at Paris, 1740. 12mo.

become of me, if thou do not exert in my behalf thy powerful influence with Jesus." (*Ibid.* p. 344.)

"*Star of the Sea*, be thou my pilot and guide in the midst of the storms which threaten me with immediate shipwreck, and lead me safe into the harbour of salvation." (*Ibid.* p. 345.)

"Mother most amiable, Mother most admirable, by your charming perfections, by your innumerable qualifications, by these charms which have gained the heart of God, by the ineffable union of the most opposite qualities, you excite admiration—Virgin and Mother together, the most elevated and the most humble of creatures. Obtain for us, Mother full of goodness, the grace to love you tenderly as the Mother of Jesus, that we may more effectually arrive at the happiness of loving Jesus himself." (*Month of Mary*, p. 34.)

"Virgin most powerful, yes, truly powerful in heaven, on earth, and in hell, since Jesus can refuse you nothing, since he wishes in some manner to make you share in his power; all the elements have felt your power in favour of your servants; you have triumphed over all heresies, crushed the head of the infernal serpent, torn from him the prey of which he thought himself most secure. Ah! make us overcome all his efforts by obtaining for us the grace of salvation." (*Ibid.* p. 47.)

"Mysterious Rose, always in bloom, you charmed the heart of God from the moment of your conception; you diffuse among men the odour of all virtues, and never will there be found in you thorns capable of wounding. Obtain for us the grace to seek to please God in all our works, to be in the good odour of Jesus Christ by the innocency of our morals, and never to wound any person by our words." (*Ibid.* p. 70.)

"Ark of the Covenant, much more holy than the ark consecrated by Moses, to signify the covenant of God with his people. In your womb, the new covenant of the Divinity with the humanity was formed —the treaty of reconciliation between God and man. Obtain for us reconciliation with God; and as the ancient ark was the refuge and hope of the Israelites, do thou be ours in all our combats and afflictions." (*Ibid.* p. 78.)

"The Month of Mary" (No. 8 in our list), of which the preceding prayers are but a small specimen, contains a series of devotional meditations and prayers for every day in the month of May, which was first dedicated to her honour in Italy, "where this *tender* devotion was first introduced." From Rome it spread into other parts of Italy, and thence into France, where the original *Italian* manual was translated into French, and from that language into English.

"The Little Testament of the Holy Virgin" (No. 7 in our list) comprises "Subjects of meditations on the principal virtues of the Blessed Virgin;" who "is supposed to speak to her beloved children." It were superfluous, after the specimens already given from the prayers directly addressed to her, to present to the notice of our readers any of the Virgin's precious legacies to her credulous votaries. But we cannot omit the two following prayers:

"O! ever blessed Virgin Mary, the avenue of God's tenderest mercies to man! Thou wert promised from the beginning of the world to *crush the serpent's head* (Gen. iii. 15,)—to bring forth the Redeemer of mankind. In thy sacred birth appears the dawn of that glorious day of grace for which all nations ardently sighed. O blessed Infant, already thou beginnest to accomplish the predictions of the prophets, and to satisfy the longing desires of the Just; already thou hast conceived in thy heart, by the most perfect love, that adorable Being, who was afterwards to be born of thee. O! happy Virgin! who entering the world didst become a victim of charity, perfectly and unreservedly submissive to the will of God, may I, even at the last hour of my life, be enriched with a share in the dispositions with which thy soul was adorned in thy earliest infancy. Accept, august Queen of Heaven and Earth, this humble offering, and obtain for me of thy divine Son, Jesus Christ, the favours I have presumed to ask through thy intercession, together with a tender, generous, constant love of God; perfect submission to his ever adorable will, the true spirit of an interior life, and the grace of our final perseverance. Amen." (*Little Testament*, p. 6.)

"O Mary! what would be our poverty and misery, if the Father of Mercies had not drawn you from his treasury to give you to earth! Oh! my life and consolation, I trust and confide in your holy name. My heart wishes to love you; my mouth to praise you; my mind to contemplate you; my soul sighs to be yours. Receive me, defend me, preserve me; I cannot perish in your hands. Let the demons tremble, when I pronounce your holy name, since you have ruined their empire; but we shall say with St. Anselm, that he does not know God, who has not an idea sufficiently high of your greatness and glory. We shall esteem it our greatest honour to be of the number of your servants. Let your glory, Blessed Mother, be equal to the extent of your name; reign after God, over all that is beneath God; but, above all, reign in my heart: you will be my consolation in suffering, my strength in weakness, my counsel in doubt. At the name of Mary my hope shall be enlivened, my love inflamed. Oh! that I could deeply engrave the dear name on every heart—suggest it to every tongue, and make all celebrate it with me. 'Mary!' sacred name, under which no one should despair. 'Mary!' sacred name often assaulted, but always victorious. 'Mary!' it shall be my life, my strength, my comfort! Every day shall I invoke it and the divine name of Jesus. The Son will awake the recollection of the Mother, and the Mother that of the Son. Jesus and Mary! this is what my heart shall say at the last hour, if my tongue cannot; I shall hear them on my death-bed—they shall be wafted on my expiring breath, and I with them, to see them, know them, bless and love them for Eternity. Amen." (*Ib.* pp. 46-48.)

What epithet but that of blasphemy can be applied to such prayers as these! What can be expected but that in all countries where such devotions are directly offered to a mortal born in sin, the most degrading ignorance must prevail. Such is known to be the case among the greater part of the Irish papists; and, for the state of Mary Worship on the continent, the following

testimonies of travellers of known probity and character, will speak for themselves.

In SPAIN nothing can exceed the devotion to the Virgin Mary. She is honoured by the Spaniards at all times. The customary salutations and common courtesies of life are not exchanged without mentioning her name. "When you enter a house, unless you wish to be considered as impious, you MUST begin with these words—*Ave Maria purissima* (hail most spotless Virgin); to which you will certainly receive this answer, *sin peccado concebida* (conceived without sin)."*

The following anecdote of the late Queen Regent of Spain (now a refugee in France), affords a recent and practical exemplification of Mary-Worship. We copy it from the *Times* newspaper of Sept. 7, 1840: "The *Correo Nacional* states that shortly after her arrival in Valencia, the Queen Regent had repaired to the cathedral to ADORE the image of 'Our Lady of the Forsaken.' After praying most fervently for some minutes, her Majesty threw herself on her knees and KISSED the feet of the statue. This pious scene (says the *Correo*) excited an extraordinary enthusiasm, and the assistants applauded and cried *Viva la reina.*"

"The Virgin Mary (says Miss Grahame) is, indeed, the goddess of ITALY: she grants all favours and averts all evils; and, while we were at Rome, her images wrought more than one pretended miracle. The Pantheon is dedicated to Saint Mary, and all Saints and Martyrs; and her pictures and effigies are numerous in it. The market-place for game, fruit, poultry, and vegetables, is in the square before it; and therefore the situation is favourable for miraculous cases, as they soon become spread by means of the market-people. It was about thirteen or fourteen months since [that is, in 1818], that a poor woman praying earnestly, and complaining of poverty, was relieved by two strangers as she arose from her prayers. She instantly imagined that the virgin had inspired her benefactors, and cried out—'A miracle!' The shrine at which she prayed was beset in consequence day and night; till, finding no more relief was granted, the crowds gradually decreased; when another Madonna, in the same church, restored a deaf and dumb boy to the use of speech and hearing. Unfortunately, however, though she taught him to speak good Tuscan, and to name most objects in nature, she omitted to teach him his own name; or rather the priests had forgotten to instruct him properly; but,

* Bourgoing's "Modern State of Spain." Vol. ii. p. 276. Cramp's "Text-Book of Popery." p. 67. second edition.

however clumsy this imposture, and though several foreigners openly laughed at it and exposed it in the church, the *people* remained convinced of the truth of the miracle; the little books, giving an account of it, were eagerly bought; and the shrine became rich in offerings."*

"In Rome (says another eye-witness, the Rev. J. Cumming),* every house is furnished with a figure or picture of the Virgin, before which a lamp is kept constantly burning. At Constance there is a handsome pillar erected, on which stands a representation of the 'Virgin and child,' with these several inscriptions:—'To Mary, the Patron of Men'—'To Mary, the most August Patron of the Diocese of Constance'—'To Mary, the Virgin of Virgins'—'To Mary, the Queen of Angels'—'To Mary, the Mother of Mercy, the most Powerful Protector of the City of Constance.'.....On a wall, near Florence, there is a figure or painting of the Virgin, represented as speaking language which it shocks me to repeat: 'I am Mary, the Daughter, the Wife, and the Mother of God, the Omnipotent and Eternal God." The term, "Mother of God," is of frequent use in the Romish Vocabulary; but here we have the blasphemy rising still higher." Our readers will cease to be surprised that such idolatry, as is above described, should exist at Rome, when they know that not only is the Bible not permitted to be read by the people, but also that the Ten Commandments are mutilated, and the second and fourth commandments are altogether omitted in Bellarmine's "Dottrina Cristiana Breve," or "Short Christian Doctrine." We quote from the London verbatim reprint of the edition, printed at Rome in 1836, by Peter Aurelj, "con licenza de' superiori."—

De' Comandamenti di Dio.	*On the Commandments of God.*
"M. Veniamo ora a quello, che si ha da operare per amare Iddio, ad il Prossimo: dite i dieci Comandamenti.	"M. Let us come now to that which is to be done, in order to love God and our neighbour. Repeat the Ten Commandments.

* Three Months Residence in the Mountains east of Rome." By Maria Grahame, page 240. The same intelligent traveller, describing the manners of the banditti who infested the vicinity of Rome, says:—"Every robber had a silver heart, containing a picture of the Madonna and child, suspended by a red ribbon to his neck, and fastened with another, of the same colour, to his left side."—*Ibid.* p. 155. Having conversed with some persons whom the banditti had taken prisoners, she states that "They shewed them the heart and figure of Madonna, which each had suspended from his neck, saying—'We know that we are likely to die a violent death; but in our hour of need we have these,' touching their muskets, 'to struggle for our lives with; and this,' kissing the image of the Virgin, 'to make our death easy.'"—*Ibid.* p. 160.

* Speech at the Annual Meeting of the British and Foreign Reformation Society.—*Missionary Register* for October, 1839, p. 446.

"D. 1. Io sono il Signore Iddio tuo: non avrai altro Dio avanti di Me.	"D. 1. I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have none other God before me.
"2. Non pigliare il Nome di Dio in vano.	"2. Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain.
"3. Ricordati di santificare le Feste.	"3. Remember to keep holy the festivals.
"4. Onora il Padre, e la Madre.	"4. Honour thy father and thy mother.
"5. Non ammazzare.	"5. Do not kill.
"6. Non fornicare.	"6. Do not commit adultery.
"7. Non rubare.	"7. Do not steal.
"8. Non dir falso testimonio.	"8. Do not bear false witness.
"9. Non desiderare la Donna d'altri.	"9. Do not covet thy neighbour's wife.
"10 Non desiderare la Roba d' altri."	"10. Do not covet your neighbour's goods."*

In the preceding extract it will be observed, that the second commandment is altogether omitted, as well as the fourth, for which last is substituted the Pope's command, to "*remember to keep holy the festivals*," which *he* has set apart for *idolatry* and *idleness*, but which GOD has set apart for LABOUR; while the day which God has commanded us to keep holy, is not even mentioned to "*remember*."

It were not difficult to multiply examples similar to those above given, of the worship actually paid to the Blessed Virgin Mary in other countries where popery is *dominant*, and the pure Word of God consequently is excluded. But the preceding instances will suffice to accomplish the object which we have in view, viz. To shew, from the accredited books of the Romish Church, her *real tenets*, and from credible testimony her *actual practice*, with regard to the worship of the Virgin Mary. "All which (to borrow the appropriate and forcible language of the eminently learned and pious Archbishop Usher,†) we do lay down thus largely, not because we take any delight in rehearsing those things which deserve to be buried in everlasting oblivion; but, *first*, that the world may take notice what kind of monster is nourished in the papacy, under that strange name *Hyperdulia*,‡ the bare discovery wherof, we are persuaded, will prevail as much with a mind that is touched with any zeal for God's honour, as all other arguments and authorities whatsoever: *secondly*, that such unstable souls, as look back unto Sodom, and have a lust to turn back unto Egypt again, may be advised to look a little into this sink, and consider with themselves, whether

* Dottrina Cristiana, pp. 23, 24. † Answer to a Jesuit, pp. 429, 430.
‡ See the term explained in p. 172, *supra*.

the stream that ariseth from thence, be not so noisome that it is not to be endured by one that hath any sense left in him of piety; and *thirdly*, that such as be established in the truth, may be thankful to God for this great mercy vouchsafed unto them."

Highly, indeed, should we esteem and reverence the blessed Virgin, who was distinguished for her humility and piety, and who enjoyed the exalted honour of being the mother of our blessed Lord. And we should imitate her holy example, and bless God for the benefit of it; endeavouring, as she did, to hear the Word of God and keep it, and to do His Will; but to invoke her mercy, or to offer up prayers through her mediation, and so to render to her divine honours:—This would be the most impious idolatry and presumptuous insult to that Divine Saviour, who is the ONLY "Mediator between God and man."

We have already seen in pp. 179-182, that the attributes and titles of Deity are by the saints and doctors of the Romish Church given to the Virgin Mary. We are tempted to trespass a little further on the attention of our readers, while we lay before them a series of PROOFS, that similar attributes and titles have, without any qualification, been given to the popes or chief bishops of the Latin Church at Rome; not one of whom is recorded to have protested or reclaimed against the ascription of such divine titles or attributes to himself. Our proofs are drawn from the proceedings of the Romish Councils, from the canon law, and from the treatises of well-known writers and defenders of the pretended papal supremacy.

Cardinal Bellarmine, the great oracle and defender of the Romish Church, boldly and unblushingly asserts, that "all the names, which in the Scriptures are given to Christ, whence it appears that he is above the Church, all these same [names] are given to the Pope."* In his treatise, "De Romano Pontifice," (book ii. ch. 31,†) Bellarmine has given a long catalogue of these titles, which our limits will not permit us to abridge; and the names and titles given to Jesus Christ in the New Testament are so numerous, that we can only select a few of the principal. To these, however, we request the attention of our readers.

---

* "Omnia nomina, quæ in Scripturis tribuuntur Christi, eadem omnia tribuuntur Pontifici." De conciliis et ecclesiâ, book ii. ch. 17. in Disputationes Roberti Bellarmini, Cardinalis. Tom. ii. p. 95. D. Parisiis, 1608. fol. We purposely quote *this* edition, because it professes to be "enlarged and amended from the book of corrections published at Rome by the author in 1607,"—"plurimis locis aucta et emendata ex correctorio libello ab auctore vulgato. Romæ. 1607." This edition of Bellarmine's Disputationes, therefore, expresses the *approved* sentiments of the papal see.

† Bellarmin. Disputationes. (Tom. i. pp. 695-697.)

Divine Titles given to Jesus Christ.
1. GOD.

Tit. ii. 13. *The Great* GOD.—1 Tim. iii. 16. GOD *manifest in the flesh.* —Acts xx. 28. . . . *The Church of* GOD, *which he hath purchased with his own blood.*—Rom. ix. 5. *Christ . . . . . who is over all* GOD, *blessed for evermore.*

Divine Titles given to the Popes of Rome.
1. GOD.

(1) Among the inscriptions on the triumphal arches raised at Rome in honour of the profligate Roderigo Borgia (who obtained the papacy by a majority of votes obtained by simoniacal promises*) at his inauguration as pope, by the name of Alexander VI. was the following:—

" Rome was great under Cæsar: now she is greatest:
Alexander VI. reigns: the former was a man; this, a GOD."†

(2) Christopher Marcellus thus addressed the fraudulently and simoniacally elected military Pope Julius II. (whose extravagant passion for war and bloodshed is said to have caused the death of not fewer than 200,000 men) in the fourth session of the fifth Lateran Council, in the year 1512:

" For thou art the shepherd; thou art the physician; thou art the governor; finally, THOU ART ANOTHER GOD UPON EARTH."‡

(3) " It is shown with sufficient evidence, that the pope (who, it is clear, was called GOD by the pious prince Constantine) cannot be bound or loosed by the secular power; and it is manifest that GOD cannot be judged by man."‖

(4) " It is not man, but GOD, who separates those whom the Roman Pontiff (who is not the vicegerent of man, but of the true God upon earth), weighing the necessities and the good of the churches, unbinds not by a human, but by a DIVINE AUTHORITY."§

Some Romanist may, perhaps, insinuate that these are comparatively ancient instances: we will, therefore, adduce two modern instances in which the Pope has been called GOD.

(5) *Saint* Alphonso Liguori, having been nominated by Clement XIII. to the bishoprick of St. Agatha de' Goti, at first declined to accept it, to which refusal the Pope at first was disposed to accede. Subsequently, however, he retracted his acceptance of Liguori's refusal, alleging that " the Holy Ghost had inspired him to do the contrary." On this determination of the Pope being communicated to him, Liguori exclaimed, " It is the will of God. *The voice of the Pope is the voice of* GOD!"¶

(6) Mauro Boni, in the dedication of his " Essay on the Studies of the [Jesuit] father Luigi Lanzi, to Pope

---

* By the righteous retribution of Divine Providence, the iniquitous career of this monster of iniquity, and of his illegitimate son, the impious Cardinal Cæsar Borgia, was terminated in the year 1503 by that poison, which they had prepared for others.

† " Cæsare magna fuit, nunc Roma est maxima: Sextus
Regnat Alexander: Ille, vir: iste, DEUS."—
Corio, Storia di Milano. Signature R iiii. a. Milano. 1503. folio.

‡ " Tu enim pastor, tu medicus, tu gubernator, *tu denique alter* DEUS *in terris.*" Labbæi et Cossart. (Sacrosancta Concilia. tom. xiv. page 109. D.)

‖ Satis evidenter ostenditur, à seculari potestate nec ligari prorsus nec solvi posse pontificem, quem constat a pio principe Constantino DEUM esse appellatum, nec posse DEUM ab hominibus judicari manifestum est." (Gratiani Decretum. Prima Pars, p. 293, apud Corpus Juris Canonici. Lugduni, 1591. 4to.)

§ " Non enim homo sed DEUS separat, quos Romanus Pontifex, (qui non puri hominis sed veri Dei vices gerit in terris), ecclesiarum necessitate vel utilitate pensata, non humana sed DIVINA potius AUCTORITATE dissolvit." (Deeretales D. Gregorii Papæ IX. suæ integritati una cum glossis restitutæ, ad exemplar Romanum diligenter recognitæ. Parisiis. 1612, cum licentia. page 205. B.C.)

¶ Lives of St. Alphonso Liguori, &c. page 28. London, 1839. 12mo.

Divine Titles given to Jesus Christ.

Divine Titles given to the Popes of Rome.

Pius VII.," the restorer of the order of Jesuits, thus terms him GOD.*

TO PIUS VII. CHIEF PONTIFF, AN EARTHLY GOD.

2. SAVIOUR.

Luke ii. 11.—*Unto you is born this day in the city of David a* SAVIOUR, *which is Christ the Lord.*

John iv. 42.—*This is indeed the Christ, the* SAVIOUR *of the world.*

Acts v. 31.—*Him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a* SAVIOUR.

Tit. i. 3.—*According to the commandment of God our* SAVIOUR.

2 SAVIOUR.

Simon Bengnius, Bishop of Modrusch, in the sixth session of the fifth Lateran Council, gives this appellation to Pope Leo X.

"Behold, God hath raised up for thee a SAVIOUR, who shall save thee from the hands of the spoiler, and shall deliver the people of God out of the hands of those who persecuted them. We have expected thee, O most blessed Leo, as the SAVIOUR *that was to come.*" †

3. KING OF KINGS.

Rev. xvii. 14.—*For he is Lord of lords, and* KING OF KINGS.

Rev. xix. 16.—KING OF KINGS *and Lord of lords.*

3. KING OF KINGS.

Balthasar del Rio, Prothonotary of the Apostolical See, thus apostrophized Leo X. at the seventh session of the same Council:

"Like the lion, the king of quadrupeds, thou—another lion—not another king of men only, but made the KING OF KINGS, and monarch of the whole earth, wouldest bring back, allure, and recall to thy fold other sheep which are not of this fold. 'Gird thyself, therefore, with thy sword upon thy thigh, O most Mighty:' for thou also hast two swords—the spiritual and the temporal."‡

Agreeably to this address, Antony Pucci applied to Leo X. the prediction relative to the Messiah, in Psalm lxxii. 11.

"As if that prophetical saying ought again to be fulfilled in thee, the only true and legitimate Vicar of Christ and of God: '*All the kings of the earth shall worship him, all nations shall serve him.*'"‖

4. THE LORD'S CHRIST.

Luke ii. 26.—*That he* [Simeon] *should not see death before he had seen the* LORD'S CHRIST. (Autho-

4. THE LORD'S CHRIST.

Cardinal Giovanni Hieronymo Albani ascribes this title to the Pope in his *Tractatus de Potestate Papæ et Concilii*, where, in the summary of contents of § 169 (fol. 67, *b*) we read absolutely that

PIO VII. PONT. MAX. TERRESTRI DEO.

* Saggio del studii del P. Luigi Lanzi.....scritto dal suo discepolo P. Mauro Boni. Venezia dalla Tipografia di Alvisopoli. 1 Gennaro. 1815. 8vo.

† "Ecce suscitavit tibi Deus SALVATOREM, qui salvabit te de manibus vastantium, et populum Dei de manu persequentium liberabit. Te, Leo beatissime, SALVATOREM venturum speravimus." (Labb. et Cossart. Concilia. Tom. xiv. col. 150. C.)

‡ "Ceu leo rex quadrupedum, tu alter leo, hominum non alter rex tantum, sed REGUM REX et orbis terrarum monarcha effectus, alias oves, quæ non sunt de hoc ovili, ad tuum ovile reduceres, alliceres, revocares. 'Accingere, ergo, gladio tuo super femur tuum, Potentissime:' nam et tu duos gladios habes, spiritualem ac temporalem." (Ibid. col. 172, A. B.)

‖ "Quasi in te, uno vero atque legitimo Christi et Dei vicario, propheticum illud debuerit rursus impleri: '*Adorabunt eum omnes reges terræ, omnes gentes servient ei.*' (Ibid. col. 236, E.)

Divine Titles given to Jesus Christ.	*Divine Titles given to the Popes of Rome.*
rised version.) — In the Anglo-popish version it is rendered *the Christ of the Lord.**	*The Pope is* THE LORD'S CHRIST. And in § 169, we read as follows: "What, therefore, will those persons say, who affirm that the Pope, WHO IS THE LORD'S CHRIST, may be deposed for any notorious crime? Let them beware, I beseech [you,] lest they fall into that saying: 'Woe, unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness.'" †
"*Non visurum se mortem, nisi prius videret* CHRISTUM DOMINI. (Latin Vulgate.)	
5. LION OF THE TRIBE OF JUDAH, AND ROOT OF DAVID. Rev. v. 5.—Behold! the LION OF THE TRIBE OF JUDAH, THE ROOT OF DAVID *hath prevailed to open the book.*——*Ecce, vicit* LEO DE TRIBU JUDA, *radix David, aperire librum.* (Latin Vulgate.)	5. LION OF THE TRIBE OF JUDAH AND ROOT OF DAVID. Simon Bengnius, Bishop of Modrusch, at the sixth session of the fifth Lateran Council, A. D. 1518, *applied these very titles* to Leo X. "But weep not, Daughter of Zion: 'for, behold, THE LION OF THE TRIBE OF JUDAH, THE ROOT OF DAVID, cometh.'"‡ This title, "LION OF THE TRIBE OF JUDAH," *was also arrogated to himself by Leo* X. in a very rare votive medal, engraved by the Jesuit Bonanni, in his Medallic History of the Popes, who has commented upon it. It represents an angel bringing a crown, which he is putting upon the head of a lion, with the inscription, VICIT LEO DE TRIBU JUDÆ:—*the* LION *of the tribe of Judah hath prevailed.* (Numismata Pontificum Romanorum á Philippo Bonanni Romæ, 1690. Tom. i. pp. 167, 168.) In page 168 he adduces other instances in which this appellation of the Redeemer is given to Leo X.
6. THE GOOD SHEPHERD John x. 14.—*I* (said Jesus Christ) *am* THE GOOD SHEPHERD.	6. THE GOOD SHEPHERD. "Ego sum PASTOR BONUS" (Latin Vulgate); *I am* THE GOOD SHEPHERD, is the title ascribed to *himself* by Innocent XI. in a medal described by Bonanni. (Tom. ii. page 741.)

Were we not apprehensive lest we should weary our readers' attention, we might adduce many other instances in which the Divine Titles attributed to our blessed Saviour are given to the sinful mortals called Popes. But we cannot close this article without laying before them proofs of two important facts, viz., that OMNIPOTENCE, which is the peculiar attribute of God our Saviour, and also *religious honour*—usually termed ADORATION —are given to the Popes.

1. OMNIPOTENCE.—"ALL *power is given to me in heaven and in earth,*" (Matt xxviii. 19,) said Jesus Christ to his Apostles; and this very attribute of Deity was given by the Archbishop of Patras to Pope Leo X., at the tenth session of the fifth Lateran

---

* Page 1003 of the Dublin edition, 1825, sanctioned by Dr. Murray, the popish Titular Archbishop of Dublin.

† "Papa est CHRISTUS DOMINI."

"Quid ergo dicent illi, qui Papam, QUI CHRISTUS DOMINI EST, pro quocunque notario crimine deponi posse perhibent? Caveant, obsecro, ne in dictum illud incidant: 'Veh vobis, qui dicitis bonum malum, et malum bonum; ponentes lucem tenebras, et tenebras lucem.'" Albani, Tractatus de Potestatæ Papæ et Concilii, in "Tractatus illustrium in utraque tum pontificii tum cæsarei juris facultate jurisconsultorum de Potestate Ecclesiastica." (Tom. xiii. Pars. I. fol. 71. *b.* Venetiis. 1584.)

‡ "Sed ne fleveris, filia Sion; quia ecce venit LEO DE TRIBU JUDÆ, RADIX DAVID."

Council, in 1515. Addressing that Pontiff, who, though a patron of literature, was eager in the acquisition of money, studious of military warfare, and devoted to sensual pleasure, games, amours, and hunting, the orator says:—

"Seize, therefore, the two-edged sword of DIVINE POWER delivered unto thee; and enjoin, command, and charge, that an universal peace and alliance be concluded among Christians for the space of ten years at least; and bind kings in the fetters of the greatness of the great king; and bind the nobles fast in the iron manacles of censures: 'FOR ALL POWER IS GIVEN UNTO THEE IN HEAVEN AND IN EARTH.'"*

This is no rhetorical flourish: it is in perfect unison with a decree of the Romish Canon Law, issued by Boniface VIII., in which he says:

"Moreover, we declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be altogether of necessity to salvation, FOR EVERY HUMAN CREATURE TO BE SUBJECT TO THE POPE OF ROME."†

This decree was renewed and approved by Leo X. in his bull read to, and passed by, the fifth Lateran Council, "with the approbation of the present holy council,"—"sacro præsenti concilio approbante."‡ Boniface VIII., however, was not the author or inventor of this monstrous proposition: he was indebted for it to one of the reputed saints of the Romish Church, *Saint* Thomas Aquinas. In the first of his treatises against the Greeks, addressed to Pope Urban IV. chap. 23 (which is a series of inferences deduced by him from the two preceding chapters) he not only asserts that "*it is necessary to salvation to be subject to the Pope of Rome*," but also that "Peter is the Vicar of Christ, that the Pope of Rome is the successor of Peter in the same power which was conferred on him by Christ, and.... that *it belongs to him to determine what is of faith.*"§

Want of space forbids us to exhibit even the briefest notice of the manner in which the Roman Pontiffs have exercised their usurped omnipotence in deposing kings, &c. &c. But we cannot omit to state, that Cardinal Bellarmine was in perfect conformity with the dogma of Aquinas, that it belongs to the

* "Arripe ergo gladium DIVINÆ POTESTATIS bis acutum; et jube, impera, et manda, ut pax universalis et colligatio per decennium inter Christianos ad minus fiat; et reges ad id in compedibus magnitudinis magni Regis liga, et nobiles in manicis ferreis censurarum constringe, 'QUONIAM TIBI DATA EST OMNIS POTESTAS IN CŒLO ET IN TERRA.'" (Labb. et Cossart. Concilia. Tom. xiv. p. 271. D. E.)

† "Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ [some copies read humanam creaturam] declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronuntiamus, omnino esse de necessitate salutis. (Extravagantes communes, Lib. i. Tit. 8. cap. 1. p. 192 B. Parisiis, 1512.)

‡ Labb. et Cossart. Concilia. Tom. xix. p. 313. A.

§ "Ostenditur etiam, quod Petrus est Christi vicarius, et Romanus Pontifex Petri successor in eadem potestate ei a Christo collata..... *Quod ad eum pertinet determinare quæ sunt fidei.*"(Aquinatis Operum Tom. xix. p. 24, Venetiis, 1787.)....." *Quod subesse Romano Pontifici sit de necessitate salutis.*" (Ibid. p. 25.)

Pope to determine what are articles of faith—when he made the following extraordinary assertion, which is a precious specimen of popish morality:

"The Catholic [that is, the Romish] faith teaches, that every virtue is good, that every vice is evil: but if the Pope should err *in commanding* VICES *and forbidding* VIRTUES, THE CHURCH WOULD BE BOUND TO BELIEVE THAT VICES ARE GOOD AND VIRTUES EVIL, *unless he wished to sin against conscience.*"*

In order to evade the force of this assertion, advocates of Popery have urged that it is simply a link in a chain of argument. The fact, that they have had recourse to such evasion, is admitted, but Bellarmine's statement is not the less an assertion for that reason: it is still, and ever will be, so long, at least, as his treatise is extant, an unblushing and positive assertion, that, if the Pope so command it, all who are in communion with him are bound to believe, "that vices are good, and virtues are evil," unless they wish to sin against conscience.

In pursuance of this usurped omnipotence in determining what are articles of faith, Pius IV., in the year 1564, presumed to add to the Nicene, or Constantinopolitan, Creed twelve *new* articles of faith, embodying all the antiscriptural and unscriptural dogmas peculiar to the *Romish Church*, which articles were published to the world only fifteen hundred and sixty-four years too late to be the religion of the TRUE *Church of Christ.* To be sure, these new modern articles have been and are schismatically opposed to a decree of the Catholic or Universal Church, viz., that of the Council of Ephesus, held A.D. 438, and subsequently confirmed by a decree of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451 (both which Councils Papists acknowledge to be General Councils): when it was determined "that it should not be lawful for any one to set forth, write, or compose, any other creed, or produce or present it to those who are willing to be converted to the knowledge of the truth, either from Heathenism or from Judaism, or from any heresy whatsoever; such persons, if bishops, shall be deprived of their episcopate, if clergy, of their clerical office.†" Such, however, is the credulity of uninformed Papists, that they implicitly believe whatever their pretended holy father and vicar of Jesus Christ chooses to impose upon them, thus "*teaching for doctrines the* COMMANDMENTS OF MEN." (Matt. xv. 9.)

* Fides catholica docet, omnem virtutem esse bonum, omne vitium esse malum: si autem papa erraret PRÆCIPIENDO VITIA, VEL PROHIBENDO VIRTUTES, TENERETUR ECCLESIA CREDERE VITIA ESSE BONA, VIRTUTES MALAS, *nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare.* (De Romano Pontifice, lib. iv. cap. 5. Disput. Tom. i. p. 804. E.)

† Labb. et Cossart. Concilia. Tom. iii. p. 689.

2. With regard to the ADORATION OF THE POPE, that we may not be charged with misrepresentation or erroneous definition, we will adduce the definition of a French—not an Italian—canonist,* who states that "the word 'ADORATION' is used, when speaking of the *religious honours*, which are paid to the Popes in certain ceremonies, as at their election."† In the rubric of the Romish service on Good Friday, the *adoration* of the material cross is enjoined; and, in the eighth rubric of the rites of celebrating mass, the officiating priest is directed reverently to exhibit the host or consecrated wafer to the congregation to be *adored*. We will now adduce two instances, out of many which might be given, of similar religious honours being paid to a sinful mortal, after his elevation to the Pontificate, and before his inauguration.

(1) *Adoration of Pope Pius II.*—"The Pope was conducted to the Church of St. Peter: and, after being *elevated on the high altar*, at the foot of the tombs of the holy Apostles, he sat upon the throne which was prepared for him, and was *there* ADORED by the cardinals, afterwards by the bishops, and lastly by all the people, who crowded to kiss his feet."‡

(2.) *Adoration of Pope Pius VIII.*, who was elected March 31st, 1829.—The following description of the "religious honours" paid to this man on his election to the Papacy, is from the pen of an eye-witness:

"We were resident at Rome during the present Pope's election. We were present at the *Adoration of the Pope*, which took place in the following manner:—

"The day after the breaking up of the conclave, having left the Pontifical Palace, he proceeded to St. Peter's. Arriving at the front entrance, he was carried on men's shoulders to the grand altar, situated in the section of the cross, in the form of which the upper end of St. Peter's is built. HE WAS SEATED UPON IT IN PLACE OF THE HOST, WHICH IS, commonly, among those of the Romish Church, SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT THE PRESENCE OF THE DEITY; thus fully exemplifying these words of the Apostle, when speaking of the Man of Sin: 'HE, AS GOD, SITTETH IN THE TEMPLE OF GOD, SHEWING HIMSELF THAT HE IS GOD.' (2 Thess. ii. 4.)"§

---

* Durand de Maillane, Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique. (Tom. i, p. 101, Col. 1. Lyons, 1776. 4to.)

† "On se sert egalement du mot d'ADORATION, en parlant des *honneurs religieux* que l'on rend aux papes en certaines ceremonies, comme dans leur election."

‡ Fleury, Histoire Ecclesiastique, avec la continuation. (Book iii. § lxix. Tom. xxiii. p. 53. Paris, 1727. 4to.)

§ Extract of a letter, from a person who had just returned from Rome, in the *Morning Herald* Newspaper. No. 15,319. published Oct. 28th, 1829. p. 2. col. 4.

*** While the preceding article was in preparation for the press, the Rev. J. E. Tyler published a truly valuable and important inquiry into "Primitive Christian Worship: or the Evidence of Holy Scripture and the Church, concerning the Invocation of Saints and Angels, and the Blessed Virgin Mary." We propose to introduce this work to the notice of our readers in the next number of our Journal.

ART. IX.—1. *The Works of the* REV. R. MONTGOMERY. 6 vols. London: Ball, Arnold, and Co. 1841.

2. *The Cherwell Water Lily and other Poems.* By the Rev. FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 1840.

3. *Recollections of the Lakes and other Poems.* By the Author of the "Moral of Flowers," &c. London: Tilt and Bogue. 1830.

4. *Whisperings of Fancy and other Poems.* By the Rev. WILLIAM MARK, B.A. London: Hamilton and Adams. 1840.

5. *Joseph, a Poem.* By Sir J. D. PAUL, Bart. D.C.L. London: Nisbet. 1841.

6. *Ruth, a Poem.* By Sir J. D. PAUL, Bart. D.C.L. London: Nisbet. 1841.

7. *The Protestant Annual for* 1841. Edited by CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH. post 8vo. Morocco. London: Bannister.

8. *The Parlour Table-Book.* Written and Edited by the Author of "Lives of the Sacred Poets." London: Rickerby. 1840.

9. *Poetical Reveries.* Translated from the French of M. de Lamartine, by the Rev. HENRY CHRISTMAS, M.A., F.S.A. London: Parker. 1840.

WE feel much pleasure in bringing under the notice of our readers the works of an excellent poet and divine. Mr. R. Montgomery has been much abused, like every other man of real talent. Much has been written against him. Were he what some critics represent him, he had passed to Lethe unnoticed and unknown. Mediocrity never becomes the conductor of undiscriminating censure. The fact is, there is much that is beautiful, original, and poetic in the genius of Robert Montgomery. A more admirable Christian, delightful companion, sound churchman, and faithful minister, we do not know. We regret he is located under the wings, though not under the jurisdiction, of another establishment. He ought to be in his

just position—that of a metropolitan clergyman. His works before us, elegant in form, chaste and christian in tone, and in all respects worthy of a Christian Minister, we earnestly commend to the patronage and perusal of those who have taste to appreciate their merits, and christian principle to value the precious truths of which the author makes his works the vehicle.

The great characteristic of Robert Montgomery's poetry is splendour: and for the sake of splendour he has, in not a few instances, sacrificed the far more important grace of simplicity. His figures, too, are frequently too abrupt, and his epithets so unusual, that the mind is hardly prepared for the one, or willing to admire the other. After making, however, full allowance for these and other faults, there still remains in the volumes of this writer so much true poetry, and not only so, but poetry of so high a character, that we cannot but give him a high place among the lights of our poetical hemisphere. How grand is the following passage:

> "And thus, a Preacher of eternal might,
> Sublime in darkness, or superb in light,
> In each wild change of glory, gloom, and storm,
> The starry magic, and the mountain form,—
> Art thou, dread universe of love and power!
> But higher still the muse's wing may tower,
> And track the myst'ry of almighty ways,—
> Through paths that glitter with the solemn rays
> The awful noon of revelation shed
> From Calv'ry,—when the God incarnate bled."

Nor would it be easy to find two more vividly painted pictures than those of the dying sceptic and the dying christian, in the third part of the same poem, viz., the "Omnipresence of the Deity." We give the passage entire, well knowing that the reader will thank us for bringing it back to his mind:

> "Lo! there, in yonder fancy-haunted room,
> What mutter'd curses trembl'd through the gloom,
> When pale, and shiv'ring, and bedew'd with fear,
> The dying sceptic felt his hour drew near;
> From his parch'd tongue no meek hosannah fell,
> No bright hope kindled at his faint farewell;
> As the last throes of death convuls'd his cheek,
> He gnash'd, and scowl'd, and rais'd a hideous shriek,
> Rounded his eyes into a ghastly glare,
> Lock'd his white lips—and all was mute despair.
>
> "Go, child of darkness! see a Christian die!
> No horror pales his lips, or dims his eye;

No fiend-shaped phantoms of destruction start
The hope religion pillows on his heart.
When, with a falt'ring hand, he waves adieu
To all who love so well, and weep so true:
Meek as an infant to the mother's breast
Turns, fondly longing for its wonted rest,
He Pants for where congenial spirits stray,
Turns to his God, and sighs his soul away!"

Willingly would we, while the volume is in our hands, extract, not "Starlight on Marathon," for that provokes a contrast with that unrivalled ode of Byron's, "Ye Isles of Greece"—but "Cæsar on the Banks of the Rubicon," a splendid production, one indeed not unworthy of the subject. The alliteration in the following stanza is peculiarly happy:

"And swiftly sped the hero on
Along his shadowy road,
And reached where rolled the Rubicon
That from the mountains flowed:
And there terrific thought's controll
Chained down the dauntless Cæsar's soul."

The first three lines are faultless; the epithet "shadowy," which, in the stanza disjoined from the context, may seem fanciful, resumes its propriety when we learn this march was

"when darkling night
Threw round her dewy veil."

A Poem which, to our taste, is all pleasant, and full of passages as brilliant, though not so meretricious, as those of Moore, is "Woman." We have opened the book at random, but it is an exquisite morceau that offers itself, and we will be content with this "sortes Montgomerianæ."

"A melody from leaf and flower,
Responding to the breeze's power,
That warbled with exulting tone;
A blooming light on all things thrown,
On fruit and foliage, grass and lake;
The song that in sweet gushes brake
From birds that flew on fearless wing,
And taught the very air to sing!"

The opening of the second Canto is also very beautiful:

"When first the wings of light unfurl'd
Their radiance o'er a new-born world,
And choral music, faint and far,
Awoke in each melodious star,
Until the glowing earth began
To thrill beneath the gaze of man!

Ah! who can paint the primal bliss
That charm'd an hour superb as this!

We do not like the word "superb;" it is un-English in such an application as this. Surely Mr. Montgomery could not have been at a loss for a proper epithet. Superb! Why, even Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer could have done as well. Take another specimen:

"And shreds of beings staggered by the heap."

We do not, however, find this strange line in the present edition of the poems; in fact, they are much improved.

But that work upon which Mr. Montgomery's claim to celebrity, as a philosophical poet, must chiefly rest, is "Satan"—a poem, *anent* which may almost be said, "quot lectores tot sententiæ." Seldom has a work of imagination been so much lauded on the one hand, or so much abused on the other. Let us spend a little time in examining it. It is a long soliloquy in which Satan delivers his sentiments "de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis:" a plot, if plot it may be called, neither unnatural nor improbable. And that the poet has rightly viewed the character of his hero may be well understood from a passage in his preface. "*The highest intellectual refinement may be associated with the greatest moral debasement.*" Such is the moral, and a noble one it is, of a poem well worth reading and re-reading. Men are so little in the habit of thinking for themselves upon subjects such as these, that the character and doings of the great Archangel of Evil are formed, for the most part, in their minds, from what sources they know not. A hate of God's will, which is, doubtless, the moving principle in the breast of the Prince of the Power of the Air, is improved into an incapacity to understand and appreciate moral beauty; a love for the low, the mean, and the ugly, a privation as well a degradation of intellectual taste. Not thus thought Milton, nor thus has written Montgomery; both view the arch-fiend as a grand and magnificent being, perverted, indeed, and degraded, hopeless, and loveless—but filled with mighty thoughts and vast projects—with knowledge such as befits the power which, alas! he still possesses; understanding much of those deep mysteries into which men are not yet permitted to look, and appreciating and admiring those very attributes against which he is, nevertheless, waging a war of extermination.

This is the true light in which to look upon him; and it may be supported not a little by the curious inconsistencies of those who hold a different view. A periodical critic, more remarkable, like wits, "for saying that which is funny than that which is

true," observes that "Montgomery makes the devil talk a dea. of twaddle, like a respectable old clergyman." Now whether respectable old clergymen do usually talk "a deal of twaddle," or whether it is peculiar to *them* so to do, we shall not now enquire, but simply remark that the same critic is equally offended with Lord Byron's "Lucifer," in "Cain, a Mystery," because he utters such shocking blasphemies—it is really quite dreadful to hear him: thus, it seems, that Byron is blamed because his picture of the devil is *not* like a clergyman, and Montgomery because his picture of the same personage *is* like one.

After all, though the view taken of Satan's character is a right one, and the poem itself both philosophical and beautiful, it is one in which the author does not appear to advantage. Montgomery should have put *his* observations into the mouth of a pure and spotless angel, lamenting for the wickedness of man. The Christian meekness, the gentle character of his own mind, albeit not incapable of sublime flights (as we have seen in the "Omnipresence of the Deity"), is ill-adapted to depict the chief of demons. The stern and almost superhuman energy of that most awful of poets, the mighty Florentine: the severe power of the republican and regicide Milton: these were the qualifications required rightly, or rather let us say adequately, to describe and bring before us, in all the fearful vividness of reality, the leader of those spirits who kept not their first estate. But we must quote one passage, beautiful, but not *dreadfully* beautiful, as should be the language of Satan:

> "But night departs, the revelry is o'er,
> And nature woos me. Through the orient heav'n
> A dawn advances, like a shining sea:
> And lo! array'd in clouds of crimson pomp,
> The gradual Morn comes gliding o'er the waves
> That freshen under her neglected smiles,
> And veil the world with glory! Rocks and hills
> Are radiantly bedeck'd; the glimm'ring woods
> And plains are mantled with their greenest robe,
> And night-tears glisten in her rosy beam.
> But in yon valleys, where from ivied cots,
> Like matin incense, wreathing smoke ascends,
> How beautiful the flush of life! The birds
> Are wing'd for heaven, and charm the air with song,
> While, in the gladness of the new-born breeze,
> The young leaves flutter, and the flow'rets sigh
> Their blending odours out. And ye, bright streams,
> Like happy pilgrims, how ye rove along
> By mead and bank, where violets love to dwell
> In solitude and stillness: all is fresh
> And gaysome. Now the peasant, with an eye

Glad as the noon-ray sparkling through a shower,
Comes forth, and carols in thy waking beam,
Thou sky-god! reigning on thy throne of light:
Sure airy painters have enrich'd thy sphere
With regal pageantry; such cloudy pomps
Adorn the heavens, a poet's eye would dream
His ancient gods had all return'd again
And hung their palaces around the sun!"

And now we turn to a new poet: one, too, who bears a name which we honour, and which calls back our minds to brighter days than those which shine now in Oxford—Mr. Faber. He is, we find, looked upon as a light of the University; and Oxford pens are busy in writing him up as once they were in writing, or attempting to write, Montgomery down.

Of the other poems on our list we can speak also with great pleasure. There is much in Mr. Faber's work that is not poetry, though the age will, perhaps, receive it as such: but that he is capable of true poetry, we adduce as a proof the verses entitled,

"NIGHTS FOR POETS.

"Is night fairest among mountains,
And by the rushy lea,
Or cradled on the fountains
Of the unpolluted sea?

"Does moonlight come most sweet-
Unto the white-faced steep, [ly
Or when it wanders lightly
In sweet paths o'er the deep?

"Are stars most pure when mak-
Jewels for mountain crest: [ing
Or with their shadows shaking
In Ocean's pearly breast?

"Is darkness grander, covering
A mountain's hollow dells,
"Than when it droopeth hovering
Upon the broad sea swells?

"Be it mountain, be it ocean,
When night comes on the earth,
If a river's quiet motion
Be near me with its mirth.

"Can any toil be sweeter
Than for me to lie and dream,
And have my time and metre
Made for me by a stream.

"Then all night's gentle seemings
Into my sleep I take,
And a long night's pleasant dream-
ings
Are poems when I wake."

Faber, pp. 144-5.

And the daughters, too, of our land are coming out in this most becoming branch of literature. The authoress of the "Moral of Flowers" has written a very graceful work, one which does alike honour to her head and her heart. Surely, though every bibliopole tells us that "poetry is a drug," "it does not sell, sir, it does not sell," there must be readers of poetry, and there must be buyers of poetry in the land, the

elegant productions of a muse so sweet and so modest are never destined, in the blaze of the nineteenth century, to rest on Mr. Tilt's shelves in Fleet-street, unromantic region that it is.

To the question, "Whether, amidst the scientific pursuits and utilitarian schemes of the day, the spirit of Poetry may become extinct?" let one whose own verses are a sufficient answer, give a reply:—

"Not while sweet Spring, in gay and frolic measure,
Light as zephyr o'er the green earth treads;
Not while bright summer, from her varied treasure,
On Nature's lap both fruits and blossoms sheds.

"Not while the yellow leaves are round us falling
And Autumn winds are at their evening song;
Not while storms rage, and deep to deep is calling,
When awful Winter madly sweeps along.

"Not while the mother o'er her infant's slumbers
Keeps loving watch the dreary night hours through:
Soothing his restlessness with broken numbers,
Too blest if she the broken spell renew.

"Not while gay childhood, through the meads and bowers,
Chases the butterfly with eager flight,
Or, wearied, sits him down to gather flowers:
None fair as he—a vision of delight!

"Not while fond youth, his soul thro' all diffusing,
Frames blissful visions in the moonlit grove:
Dreaming, while Hope and Fancy shape his musing,
That earth is Paradise, and life is love.

"Not while Hoar Age, what time the tempest rages,
Seated in chimney nook, with glistening eye
Turns to that book whose heaven-inspired pages
Teach Age and Youth alike to live and die.

"Not while the muse such scenes as these can borrow
From life and nature, or the human heart
Can thrill with hope, or love, or fear, or sorrow—
Can song be mute, or poesy depart."

Recollections of the Lakes.

And now comes another Reverend bard. We had begun to write about the *youthful* author whom we supposed to have just taken his first degree from St. Mary Hall; very pleasing sentences were about to trickle from our pen about the promise of his riper years, and the pleasure with which we beheld the junior members of the Universities coming forward in the fields of poetry; about our unwillingness to exercise a severe criticism upon the productions of a young man but just out of his under-

graduateship: when lo! our eyes fell upon a paragraph in a northern paper, and we learn that the congregation of Christ Church, Tynemouth, have presented a piece of plate to the afternoon lecturer, the Rev. William Mark, B.A., as a testimony of their respect for the manner in which, for three-and-twenty years, he has exercised among them the office of a minister. He is then a man of middle age, and is, moreover, about to leave the country. So our plans are entirely overturned; and as we cannot hope much better productions, we will say but little about these: they exhibit a respectable mediocrity. We leave, then, the "Whisperings of Fancy" to those who may fancy them. Yet ere we do so, we will point out a passage which does the author some credit. He is speaking of superstition, and instancing the case of those who "tremble without believing."

> "It is a glen—and where yon fir-trees spread
> Their green-clad branches o'er the river's bed,
> Untaught the storms of human life to brave,
> A wretched being sought a watery grave!
>
> The time—the place—the dreadful tale combined
> To waken phantoms to the fearful mind.
> By superstition still his mind imbued,
> The tales of youth by fancy now review'd,
> With cautious steps, as if afraid to wake
> The wild birds slumbering in the neighbouring brake;
> The traveller hastens on—the place is near,
> His shorter breathing tells his growing fear,
> His faultering steps— his ever-watchful eye,
> His half-suppressed yet oft repeated sigh,
> His trembling frame, as if by palsy seized,
> Unfold the workings of 'a mind diseased.'"

Turn we now from a Bachelor of Arts to a Doctor of Civil Law—from the "Whisperings of Fancy" to the records of inspiration. Let us call up around us the scenery of the gorgeous East, and meditate with Sir John Dean Paul on the histories of Joseph and Ruth. We shall confine our remarks chiefly to the latter, though we recommend both to the reader. The history of Ruth stands alone in the sacred writings. It has no wondrous record of miracles or prophecies to offer us: it is no tale of kings and captains, of wars and victories: it is but a simple domestic story, more beautiful and more affecting from its unadorned truthfulness, than were it tricked out in all the meretricious sentimentality of a Parisian novel. But why is it preserved? why comes it down to us in the canon of Sacred Scripture? why is this one incident alone given to us by "the traditions of the elders," while all the family history of the

nation beside is utterly lost? The answer is easily given: it is, as Sir John Paul well remarks, "because Ruth forms an important link in the great chain of the history of the Redeemer." The facts related to us concerning that stock from which the Messiah descended, are of such a nature as to show the narrative to be the work of "one whose ways are not as our ways." The humiliating circumstances related concerning the earthly progenitors of the Messiah, are well calculated to teach us that "he took not on himself the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham"—a sinful and degraded race,—that he might redeem them from sin and degradation. Ruth, too, was a Gentile: and thus "from this union of Jew and Gentile sprung the Messiah: which we may regard as typical of the call of the Gentiles, since manifested." We have spoken of the simple and unadorned character of the book of Ruth, and this characteristic is well transferred into the pages of Sir J. D. Paul. There we find the same calm beauty, the same deep but not vehement tenderness. Let us bring before the reader a passage or two, which will remind him of the period before Byron introduced the reign of stormy passion:

"It was the mark of death, with aspect pale;
Now Chilion droop'd, his strength began to fail;
Others had hope, all things in hope were done;
Others had trust in med'cine, Ruth had none.
Hour after hour were human means applied,
Death claim'd his own, and both the brothers died.
The house of mourning often is the place,
Water'd by tears, where grows the plant of grace,
The grief that wounds the heart, and makes it bleed,
Prepares the soil to take the blessed seed.
'Twas thus with Naomi; to her, things seem
Like warning pictures, in prophetic dream.
Her land forsaken, and her faith forgot,
Point to the cause of her unhappy lot.
Submissive, bowing to the chast'ning rod,
Sigh'd for her father land, and turned to God."

Again: there is a description of a rural banquet, in page 27, which recalls the cadences of Parnell's Hermit—a poet, by the bye, to whom Sir J. D. Paul bears, in many points, a strong resemblance.

"Thrice happy days, when past'ral suns like these,
Could cheer the heart, and innocence could please;
Ere dainties, purchas'd by the vice of wealth,
The taste corrupted, and impair'd the health;
Ere man, by culture spoil'd, had learnt, thro' pride,
His brother man in scorn to put aside.

Where purl'd a brook, with cool and gurgling sound,
Where the wild thyme and musky flow'rs were found,
Beneath that loftiest roof, the azure sky,
That cloudless, all-excelling panoply,
Behold the group! the men with labour worn,
Beneath a burning sun, with patience borne,
Now stretch'd at ease, their wives and daughters near,
With food to renovate, and smiles to cheer.
E'en in the midst their master had reclin'd,
Courteous to all, but most to Ruth was kind;
And ere the meal began, his eyes he rais'd,
And grateful said, 'Let Israel's God be prais'd.'
Each bow'd the head, and each with rev'rence then
Clos'd their Lord's grace, and echoed an 'Amen.'"

It is pleasant to praise, and we would gladly praise for ever; but, lo! there cometh the sound of a brazen trumpet, and the apparition of a blue book, and our business of praising is for a time at an end—one of the Annuals having (like its editor or editors) lost its way, has strayed on to our table: and it is called the "Protestant Annual!"

The announcement of this work (if work it may be called), while it did not surprise us, excited in our mind considerable doubt as to what its character might be. When we saw among the contributors the names of Bickersteth and Robert Montgomery, we knew we should find something that a churchman could read with pleasure; when we saw those of Chalmers, Finch, Cumming, and McNeile, we knew that the ground taken up against Romanism would not be that of Catholic antiquity, but of individual learning and private judgment; and when we cast our eyes on the name of Charlotte Elizabeth as editor or editress (we hardly know which to call her, for she is rather a gentlemanlike than a ladylike personage), we feared that we should perceive a very bitter party-spirit shed over the volume. Now the book is out, and it is both better and worse than we expected—there is less bitterness and less talent. None of the writers have done their best; and after examining both pictures and print, we confess we think the Protestant Annual a failure. The binding, which is really elegant, is by far the best part of the production.

With what pleasure do we turn from the modern vapidness of the "Protestant Annual," to the "pure well of English undefiled." How great is the relief to turn aside and talk with the mighty dead, the giants of past days. Mr. Willmott, with that peculiar felicity which has distinguished all his works, has here made the fields of our English literature a fit resort for

"retired leisure
That in trim gardens takes his pleasure."

And in these trim gardens, cool, quiet, and refreshing, do we commune with Norris, and More, and Cowley, and Clarendon —we pluck the flowers of Jonson, and Surrey, and Sidney, and Drummond: and hear, from time to time,

> "Such strains as would have won the ear
> Of Pluto, to have quite set free
> The half-regained Eurydice."

This *is* a Protestant Annual, (we should like one every year,) for it protests against vice, and error, and superstition of all kinds; and we think he who reads it through can hardly fail to rise from its perusal "a better man." Mr. Willmott selects with feeling as well as judgment, for he may say

> "Anche io son pittore."

As a proof we give a beautiful passage from a series called "Heads from the Antique:"

HOMER.

"Oh! Poet of the world, each muse
Hath pitched her radiant tent before thee,
Crowning thy head with richest hues,
Folding her brightest garment o'er thee.
Upon the blackening battle storm
The bow of thy soft fancy streams,
And Cytherea's beauteous form
Upon the blood-stained armour beams.
Oft when awhile from this sad life
Our weary hearts would fain be free,
Forgetful of each care and strife,
Sweet traveller, we sail with thee
Into that blue unruffled sea
Where love and beauty ever smile
On fair Calypso's sunny isle.
Led by thy hand, delightful guide,
Into enchanted homes we glide:
And floating over rivers old
Sit 'neath the Hesperian tree of gold." (p. 120.

One more from these "Heads from the Antique."

"Thy memory, like a cloud of gold,
Across the shadowy chamber floats,
Flushing the floor with sunshine; Night
Enamoured, drinks the dewy notes
That oft in summer's melting light,
Sighed round the Arcadian shepherd's fold:
On thy transparent verse appear,
As in a crystal stream, the grace,
The bloom, the beauty of thy face,—
And Sappho's living soul is here." p. 208.

We would quote more, but time presses, and our space admo-

nishes us. Of the last work on our list, we have no longer any room left to give an opinion: we, therefore, make an extract that it may speak for itself.

MEDITATION XVI.

PRAYER.

"Lo! where the king of day in glory bends
From his bright car, and to his couch descends,
The sparkling clouds that hide him from our eyes,
Show by their gleam his pathway in the skies.
And while the waves of purple flood the west,
The pale Moon lifts her head, and leaves her rest,
High in the azure vault her beauties glow,
And her rays slumber on the turf below.
It is the hour when Night on every hill
Lets fall her veil, when Nature, calm and still,
Between the night that comes—the day that flies,
To Him who made them, lifts her dewy eyes;
And offers up, in all unrivalled lays,
The glorious homage of Creation's praise.
Behold the universal offering shine,
Space the vast temple, and the earth the shrine:
The Heavens its dome, and each retiring star,
Whose half-veiled lustre decks the skies afar,
Placed in the azure vault, is but a bright
And holy lamp, hung there the fane to light;
And those pure clouds, tinged by the parting day,
Which the light zephyr, as it wafts away,
Rolls into rosy billows to the gloom
Of the far darkness—these are but the fume
Of Nature's incense—upward still it tends,
And the throne of Nature's God ascends.
Silent the temple! where the holy song,
That to heaven's King arises, sweet and strong:
All—all is still, my heart alone can swell
The hymn of praise, and Nature's homage tell.
On Zephyr's wings, and on the evening's rays,
To God's abode her living incense raise;
Give to each creature, silent else, a tongue,
And lend herself for Nature's sacred song.
Invoke a Father's love around to shine,
And fill the deserts with his name divine;
And he who, bending from his palace dread,
Lists to the music of the spheres he made—
He hears the voice of Reason's humble prayer,
Address his glory, and his name declare."

Ecclesiastical Report.

We intend, as we stated in October, to enter upon certain matters, connected especially with the state of Religion and the Church in the Colonies, and with the subject of education at home, for which we had not space in that number. So important, indeed, are the affairs of the Colonial Church that many articles may be written upon them without exhausting the subject. India, North America, the West India Islands, all are exclaiming with a voice that we cannot avoid hearing, and which we must not neglect, "Come over, and help us!" We are exerting ourselves, both at home and abroad, as individuals, and events are we trust taking a turn of such a character, that we shall be no longer left to private benevolence—the Government will, we hope, be persuaded to "do its duty." There are also other subjects, of a miscellaneous character, upon which we shall dwell. Our ecclesiastical proceedings are daily becoming more interesting, from the vast importance of the various interests involved. So important, indeed, is the question, with respect to the religious state of our colonies, that it forces itself, every session, upon the attention of the legislature—even upon the House of Commons: though, a few years since, it was scarcely possible for a member to obtain a hearing in that assembly on any subject connected with Religion or the Church. We proceed, therefore, to notice some of those important matters which are so intimately connected with the welfare of our fellow-subjects.

THE CHURCH IN THE COLONIES.

Every Briton must feel anxious for our colonial possessions. Not a few of us are, in some way or other, connected with them. Information, too, is so widely circulated, that almost every person who reads the ordinary newspapers becomes, in some degree, acquainted with the state of his fellow-subjects in the various colonies of this great empire. At home the Church of England is extending herself in every direction amongst those neglected thousands of our population, which have sprung up in our large towns and populous districts since the time of the Reformation, when the parochial edifices were sufficient for the wants of the people. The parochial system is an admirable piece of machinery. Whatever may be the amount of our population, the whole are connected with some particular parish: and when pecuniary means are forthcoming, nothing is required but to erect chapels of ease or district churches, or to separate an extensive parish in several portions. All this is easily accom-

plished in England. And we hold it to be the duty of the State to extend to the colonies all the privileges which are enjoyed by the mother country. Already much has been done by the legislature. The Church of England is a blessing to this country. The parochial system is a blessing, as thousands and tens of thousands, who experience the kindness of a clergyman, can testify. These blessings, therefore, should be extended to our colonies. This has, in some measure, been done: but not to the extent which the circumstances of the case require. The Church is doing great things in the colonies by individual efforts—we mean by the voluntary exertions of various societies.

With respect to India, undoubtedly the Church would be supported without any pecuniary assistance from this country; but supposing such were not the case: when we consider the wealth which is poured into the land from our Indian empire, we cannot be unwilling to make some return by sending out bishops and clergy to superintend the spiritual concerns of the millions of British subjects in the eastern hemisphere.

It may be asked, what more can be done for India? In reply to such a question, we would ask, what has the state yet done? Societies have done much, but the State has done comparatively little. We are thankful indeed for that little, and we regard it as an earnest of better things: but we affirm that the State is under a solemn obligation to do much more. The question, then, admits of an easy answer. Let bishops and clergy be appointed in all our colonies, commensurate with the extent and wants of the population. At present there are three bishops in the whole of our Indian empire, and the clergy are scattered over the country in the same proportion. What can be effected by such slender means? Let India be divided into sees of such an extent as to be brought within the compass of one man's capabilities; let each see be filled by an active bishop; let a sufficient number of clergymen be appointed: so that every part of our Indian possessions may present something like the appearance of an ecclesiastical establishment. Were such a state of things to be established in India, thousands of the heathen population would almost daily become acquainted with the Gospel. At all events, we should have the satisfaction of knowing that, as a nation, we had done our duty.

To assert that nothing has been effected, is far from our purpose: but we contend that it is but very little. It is, however, cheering to find, that the efforts of our Church in our colonies are so abundantly blessed: and assuredly the benefits already resulting from those efforts may be regarded as an indication of much more extensive good, should the state awake from its

slumbers, and extend the blessings of a Church establishment to the whole of our colonies. Some notices of the proceedings of our bishops and clergy in our distant possessions, may serve to shew that our anticipations of more extensive good, in the event of a more extended ecclesiastical establishment being resolved on by the legislature, are by no means fanciful or visionary.

Already we have TEN bishops in our different colonies, of whom three are placed over our vast Indian territories. Had as much been effected before the American war, it is more than probable that the United States would never have separated from the mother country. Had a Church establishment commensurate with the wants of the people been erected, the ties by which the colonies would have been bound to this country would not have been easily sundered. Until lately we were content to leave onr colonies to the exertions of clergymen without any episcopal superintendence or control.

The merit of arousing the English government on this important point belongs exclusively to the *venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.* The committee of that society saw the necessity of having an ecclesiastical establishment in the colonies, and especially in India, (to which their efforts were first directed,) in so strong a light, that they continued year after year to memorialize the government on the subject. In the year 1812 a very strong memorial was presented: and in 1814 directions were given by the government for creating the Bishopric of Calcutta. The venerable society had proposed that an archbishop and three bishops should compose the ecclesiastical establishment in our Indian empire. Had this measure been adopted, the archbishop would have resided at Calcutta, and the three bishops would have been appointed to Madras, Bombay, and Ceylon. At that time the government did not consider it expedient to comply with all the recommendations of the venerable society: but they determined to send out a bishop to preside over the Church in India. It was argued by all who favoured the measure, that there should be such an establishment of pastoral care and superintendence in that distant colony, as might, in some degree at least, correspond with our Church establishment at home. Though, however, the entire scheme recommended by the society was not adopted, yet the country at large was thankful to the government for such a manifestation of goodwill towards the population of India.

In the year 1814, Bishop Middleton went out to Calcutta, the *first* Protestant prelate in the east. He died in the year

1822, since which period, three of his successors have followed him into the "joy of their Lord." In the year 1835, Madras was erected into a bishopric, and Bombay in 1837. Three bishops, therefore, are now labouring in India; but what are they to such a vast population? Nay, how is it possible for them to superintend the spiritual concerns of our extensive Indian possessions? Already several prelates have fallen a sacrifice to the exertions necessary to the execution of their office; and unless many more bishops are sent out, others will soon follow those who are already departed.

Since the appointment of Bishop Middleton to the see of Calcutta, seven other prelates have been placed in the various colonies of the British empire, in the West Indies, Canada, Nova Scotia, Australia, and Newfoundland. But what are seven bishops to these extensive colonies? Is it possible for them to superintend the spiritual concerns of the people committed to their care? Wherever Great Britain establishes a colony, there the Church ought to be established too. If it be a duty to support the Church at home, it is equally a duty to do so in our colonies. In most of our possessions the native population are immersed in heathen darkness; nor is it possible to remove that darkness by individual efforts, or by the combined efforts of individuals in societies or associations. To accomplish the object, the Church must be planted in each colony; and the bishops and clergy should be sufficiently numerous to meet the wants of the population. If it be necessary to maintain a military force to uphold the power which we have acquired, surely there ought to be a body of clergy to seek after the souls that are "perishing for lack of knowledge."

The various accounts which reach this country from the bishops and clergy in our distant possessions are of the most cheering and gratifying description. They prove that the Church of England is exactly qualified to convey the blessings of salvation to the benighted nations of the earth. It is most gratifying also to learn that the East India Company have responded to the prayer of the Bishop of Calcutta, and that they have made a grant towards the erection of the cathedral in our Indian capital, amounting to the sum of *forty thousand* pounds. It is still more gratifying to learn, that the Company have signified that, in their opinion, it is the duty of the government to provide for the spiritual wants of the people in the east. We trust that the Honourable Company will not be satisfied until the Church of England in India is quite able to extend her influence over the whole population of that vast empire. Let the Church be maintained in India, and the people of England will soon see the

necessity of pursuing a similar course in our other colonies. The following extract from a letter written by the Bishop of Australia is so pertinent, that we shall make no apology for submitting it to the notice of our readers:—

"My maxim is by all means to strengthen the Church of England in this quarter; and this cannot be effectually done, except by enabling her to expand wherever she goes her proper system of polity, her orders of bishop, priest, and deacon. As to the latter, I presume we need not despair of finding means for their support, though upon a humble scale: and the question as to the bishops must be met boldly in the best way that circumstances will admit. I can from experience say, that the occupation is not a gainful one, according to the present system: but if it be found really impossible to obtain the means of providing for them incomes to maintain them as heretofore, in the foremost rank in society, we must be content, as colonial bishops, to take a lower room in civil life, and be satisfied with maintenance in a decent mediocrity of circumstances: but be this as it may, I am convinced that bishops we must have in increased numbers ere long, or the fabric of the Church cannot for a continuance be held together."

This passage is exceedingly important, containing as it does the testimony of one who had had abundant opportunities of forming an accurate judgment on the important subject on which he speaks. He is convinced that the welfare of our Church in the colonies depends on the sufficiency of the number of the bishops to superintend the clergy in their important labours.

We have already remarked that the existence of bishops in India is owing to the persevering efforts of the *venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.* Within the last two years, the society have made another most vigorous effort to obtain an increase in the number of bishops and clergy in all our colonial possessions. At a special general meeting of the society, a petition was adopted on the subject of the Church in the colonies, which was presented to both Houses of Parliament.

We hope that the *Venerable Society* will not relax in their efforts. Let them remember that it was not until after repeated memorials that the Bishopric of Calcutta was founded. The legislature was at last compelled to listen to the application; and by persevering in the same course it will not be possible for any government long to resist the call of the people. Something, however, may in the mean time be done by private efforts; and the Bishop of London has submitted a proposal, in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which we hope to see generally adopted. His lordship proposes the formation of a fund for the endowment of bishoprics in the colonies. The matter was taken up by "The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge," and *ten thousand pounds* have already been voted by a special meeting in furtherance of the proposed plan.

The advantages arising from the division of our country into parishes, are so well known and so generally admitted, that it is unnecessary to expatiate upon them. In any ecclesiastical arrangement for our colonies, we should recommend that each diocese be divided into a certain number of parishes, over which one or more clergy, according to their extent, should be appointed. At first these parishes must be very extensive; but as the number of clergy increases, they might be divided and subdivided, until at length the whole of our colonial possessions would be as well superintended as the mother country. We have divided our possessions into provinces, and various lesser sections; it would be perfectly easy to convert those provinces or sections into dioceses or parishes, as the circumstances of each colony might require.

In every communication from the bishops already fixed in our colonies, the necessity of increasing the number of prelates and clergy is strongly urged. Every one who has resided in any of the dependencies of the British crown—nay, every one who reads the various information which exists on the subject—feels assured that the amount of good will be greatly confined, until our government shall see fit to pursue towards the colonies the course which we have recommended—the only course worthy of a powerful Christian nation.

EDUCATION AT HOME.

From the state of the Church in the colonies, we turn to the state of Education at home—a subject confessedly of great importance in the present age, an age of knowledge: but if the poor are not trained in proper principles, their knowledge will prove a curse and not a blessing. Schools of all descriptions exist in every part of the country. Some are conducted on the principles of the dissenters, and others are so managed that religion is altogether excluded; while there are some in which the principles of infidelity are openly taught. At present we have a Church establishment and a parochial clergy, to whom is entrusted the spiritual charge of our population; for the existence of dissent does not destroy the claim of the parish minister. He can go into every cottage, and in general he is received with a hearty welcome. It cannot be denied that the rising generation form a most important part of the minister's charge. It is, therefore, necessary that schools in connexion with the Church should be established in every parish, of such dimensions as to afford accommodation for all the poor children. Probably it might be alleged in some cases that large schools are unnecessary, inasmuch as many are educated by various bodies of dissenters, or by the Lancasterian society: but this

circumstance has nothing to do with the question. The Church is the Church of the nation; the clergy are the spiritual pastors of the *whole* population, whether their services are regarded or rejected; and, therefore, it is a plain duty to provide schools for all. We are also fully persuaded, that most of the poor would send their children to the school conducted under the superintendence of the parochial chergyman. As churchmen we must claim the right of providing education for all, whether they receive it or not.

The National Society has now existed for a considerable period. Its assistance is granted to schools in various ways: sometimes by a grant of money towards the erection of a school-room: at other times by a present of books. Every clergyman, in short, may receive aid in some way or other on an application to the Society. In many populous districts it may not be possible for the parishioners to support a school without assistance from others. What we wish, therefore, is that the National Society should be so supported, that every destitute parish might be supplied with the means, in conjunction with the contributions of the inhabitants, of supporting a school capable of containing all the children of the poor. To accomplish this object by merely voluntary contributions is not to be expected. We contend, therefore, that the deficiency should be supplied by the State, in the shape of an annual grant, larger or smaller, according to the claims on the Society. We would have the National Society to be the dispenser of the bounty of the State. The means would be contributed by the State, but they would flow to the people through the channel of the National Society. Until something of this kind be adopted, many of our poor and populous districts will be destitute, at least to a very considerable extent, of the means of education.

Our readers are aware that something has been done by the government within the last few years—or perhaps it would be more correct to state, that certain proposals have emanated from her Majesty's Government; but the original plan was so clogged with conditions that it was not possible for the clergy to avail themselves of the offer from the State. A system of *inspection* was proposed to which all schools should be subjected if they received any assistance from the grant. The money voted by Parliament was intended for the erection of school houses, and any clergyman who should apply for aid, pledged himself to receive the government inspector. The consequence was, that the clergy refused to make any application for money; and the National Society remonstrated, and plainly

told the government that the Church could not submit to such terms. Negotiations, therefore, were entered into between the Archbishop of Canterbury, on the part of the Church, and the Committee of the Privy Council, by whom the distribution of the money was managed. In fact, the Privy Council gave way, for they soon perceived that they could not maintain their ground against the Church: they consented to an arrangement which satisfied the Archbishop, according to which the inspector cannot be appointed without the concurrence of the Archbishops, each in his respective province. In the event of any dissatisfaction, the Archbishops are at liberty to withdraw their concurrence, upon which the authority of the inspector would cease, and a new appointment must take place. All this is very satisfactory, and the National Society now feels itself at liberty to recommend any particular school to the Committee of Privy Council, who will receive any such recommendation. The Committee of Council have intimated, that, though not precluded from receiving applications from other quarters, they will listen with special attention to those from the Society. The National Society, on its part, will not confine its recommendations to schools in connexion with itself, but will recommend any *Church* school, whether in union or not. The Church of England, therefore, thanks to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the National Society, may *partake* in the Parliamentary grant.

But is it consistent in a government professing to be members of the Church of England, as is the case at least with the majority of its members, to grant money to those who are actuated by feelings of the bitterest hostility against our ecclesiastical establishment? Or is it consistent in dissenters to receive such grants of public money for educational purposes, when they are constantly ringing the changes on the subject of the voluntary principle; and when, too, they are perpetually declaiming against what they term the *State Church*, and disclaiming the very notion of what they designate a *State* connexion? We reply that there is great inconsistency in the conduct of both parties—in *that* of the Government, because they are bound to support the Church of England as the Church of the land, and to provide her with the means of furnishing education to all those who are unable to pay for it; and in *that* of dissenters, because to receive a grant of public money for the purpose of training up children in the principles of dissent, which is the case in all their schools, is just as much a dependence on the State, as it would be to receive money from the same quarter for the payment of their ministers.

On the part of the dissenters, indeed, the inconsistency is marvellous, on account of their constant declamations against State patronage, and their repeated boasts of the excellency and the sufficiency of the voluntary principle. If the voluntary principle be sufficient for the support of their ministers and the erection of chapels, it is sufficient, surely, for the erection and support of schools. If nothing more is required for adults, nothing more is necessary for children. We contend, therefore, that it is highly inconsistent in dissenters to receive any portion of public money for the support of their schools. To be consistent with their own principles, they ought to refuse to take a single shilling of the money of the public. They are inconsistent, too, on another ground. For instance, they grievously complain of church-rates, on the ground that it is unfair to call upon dissenters to assist in keeping in repair certain edifices, in which they themselves never worship. Yet these very men can receive money which is granted by the State, and, therefore, is derived more from the pockets of churchmen than from those of dissenters, inasmuch as the latter, when compared with the former, are a mere fraction of the community. These men of tender consciences, however, see nothing in a churchman's contributing to support dissent, which is done to a far greater extent, through the various grants of public money made to dissenters, than the amount paid by the latter in the form of church-rates.

Alas! for dissent and voluntaryism, dissenters are always ready to grasp the public money. When did a dissenter refuse? Have they ever acted on their own principles in declining to take the money of the state? Never! On the contrary, it is received with eagerness—yea, with greediness. Nor do we place any reliance on the avowals of dissenters respecting their abhorrence of a connexion with the state. Example is better than precept: and actions would do much more in evincing the sincerity of dissenters in this matter than speeches. True, they declaim against a connexion with the state, because they know that no such connexion can ever take place. Is it asked why it cannot take place? The answer is easy. They are broken into a "thousand-and-one" fractions: so that if the Church of England should cease to be connected with the state, it would not be possible for the dissenters to unite in one form of ecclesiastical polity, which must be the case if they were to become the national church. If all dissenters from the Church of England were of one mind, we should never hear such denunciations of all connexion of the Church with the State. On the contrary, there would, in that case, be a constant struggle

with the Church for the pre-eminence, just as it was with the Puritans in the time of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I., and with the Non-conformists in the reign of Charles II., for both those bodies contended that an established church was necessary: and the only question was, whether they or the Episcopalians should constitute that Church. Since the periods alluded to new opinions on these matters have sprung up: and now all dissenters have adopted the principle of Independency, which admits of as many parties as individuals, and permits every man to act as a minister, no one being at liberty to raise his voice on the subject. If any one party, however, saw a fair chance of raising itself to that connexion with the State which is now enjoyed by the Church of England, the effort would be made to gain the enviable position. But such a thing is impossible: and perceiving the impossibility of connecting themselves with the State, the dissenters, one and all, persist in declaiming against any such connexion as a most unholy alliance. Our position is proved by the eagerness with which they grasp any money, for any purpose, which the State may think proper to offer.

The National Society, after all, is making its way in the country at large. Few of the poor, except in those cases in which some sinister influence is used, send their children to any schools besides those which are conducted by the clergy and the National Society. Cases may, indeed, exist, in which considerable numbers are being trained in the schools of dissenters: but it will be found, on examination, that the very existence of such schools is owing to the negligence of the Church in those particular districts. Let the clergy and the laity in every parish, in conjunction with the National Society, exert their influence in establishing schools in proportion to the population of their respective districts, and the children of the poor will be readily placed under their superintendence. The poor of this country still look up with reverence and respect to their ministers; they view them as their friends; and they will be anxious for them to be the guides and directors of their children.

CHURCH-RATES.

The *martyr*, Thorogood, was not liberated, but forcibly removed from his prison, in consequence of the payment of the *rate*, and the *costs* of the suit, which his own obstinacy had brought upon him, by some individual who affected to be influenced by feelings of commiseration for the misguided man. Such a case was never before known. We can conceive that a man would entertain the strongest repugnance to the taking up

his lodging in a prison, and that he would use all the means in his power to prevent such a misfortune from overtaking him; but we never did think it possible for an individual to be so enamoured of a gaol as to quit it with reluctance. Such, however, was the case with Thorogood; he wished to remain; and though the prison doors were thrown open, he did not take advantage of the circumstance: but it was necessary to expel him by force from his very comfortable quarters. The truth is, Thorogood was a great gainer in the business: and so far from suffering any privation, he enjoyed many more privileges than are likely again to fall to his lot. It is certain that he will now sink down into his former insignifigance: and though the high-sounding epithet of *martyr* may be applied to him by the radical and dissenting press, yet it will not be possible to awaken the sympathy of the public in his favour, and he will speedily be as unknown as he was prior to his *martyrdom.* No doubt the dissenting *divines,* who embraced his cause, expected that her Majesty's ministers would have shielded him by their patronage, and that some "heavy blow and great discouragement" would have been given to the Church in the shape of a bill for the abolition of church-rates. In this expectation they have been miserably disappointed; for, instead of sympathy for Thorogood, the ministers spoke strongly of his obstinacy, and instead of adopting measures for his release, they admitted that the law must take its course, and that it must be obeyed.

It appears, however, that certain efforts have been made by the *voluntaries* to raise Thorogood in the estimation of the public: for he was likely to be at a *discount.* It seems that another individual, a Mr. Baines, is ambitious of pursuing the course which has proved so profitable to Thorogood: expecting, probably, that he shall, by his opposition to church-rates, acquire an equally enviable notoriety. Mr. Baines refused to pay the rate, and disputed the authority of the civil magistrate to levy it, thus bringing himself within the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical court. The rate was pronounced to be valid: and, as a natural consequence, he was condemned in the costs. Having persisted in his course, he was at length safely lodged in Leicester gaol, on the 13th of November, where he is likely to continue. Whether he will be as successful as Thorogood in obtaining pecuniary supplies, or whether any friend will step forward to pay the costs of the suit and to liberate him from confinement, remains to be proved.

Of course Mr. Baines is regarded as a *martyr* by the whole tribe of radicals and voluntary dissenters. As Thorogood was just liberated when Baines was incarcerated, it was deemed de-

sirable to make a public demonstration; and, to grace the occasion, John Thorogood was invited to take the chair at a public meeting of the new martyr's friends. This was a very extraordinary position for Thorogood to occupy: still he did not decline the honour. The meeting assembled: the chair was taken by the martyr, who even delivered himself of a speech on the occasion, in which he advanced certain statements, which we do not like to characterise by their proper designation. He told the people of his "damp and dreary dungeon in Chelmsford gaol:" yet no one could have had a better apartment, or have been better attended to. It is sad to find a man like Thorogood, who talks of the "want of spiritual-mindedness in the clergy," so reckless with respect to the truth. Where was his own "spiritual-mindedness" on the occasion?

At the same meeting Mr. Thomas Slingsby Duncombe was designated as the friend of "religious liberty." How surprised must Mr. Duncombe be to find himself put forth as a religious character at all. Perhaps he is smiling at the folly of those dissenting ministers who supported Thorogood on the occasion in question. Mr. Duncombe did not attend, but he did the next best thing—he sent a letter, which was read at the meeting. The letter, too, contains, *mirabile dictu*, something which will be found to be *true*. He states that they are not to expect any alteration of the system from the present government, or from the House of Commons as at present constituted. The government evening organ, the *Globe*, indeed, while it abused the Church, expressed itself at the time strongly against the course pursued by Baines and Thorogood. It is true that it complained of the system: but it spoke of obedience to the laws until they are repealed. The government therefore will have no sympathy for Mr. Baines in his prison: and, according to Mr. Duncombe, the Commons will do nothing; he therefore insinuates that that assembly needs another reform. How would Mr. Duncombe delight in the application of *Colonel Pride's purge* to the present House of Commons, as it was applied by Cromwell to one of its predecessors!

The scene on the occasion of this public meeting at Leicester was closed with an exhibition of profanity rarely equalled, certainly never surpassed. On the morning after the meeting, several dissenting ministers and others assembled, with Thorogood, in order to pay a visit to Mr. Baines in the prison. After some time had been spent in the interview, it was proposed, by these dissenting ministers, that Thorogood!—yes, that Thorogood!—should engage in prayer with the prisoner and his friends!! If such proceedings as these are not calculated to

pour contempt on the sacred subject of religion, we are very much mistaken. To manifest the deepest interest in worldly politics, and then to unite in prayer to God, at such a time, was a profanation of the sacred name, which we cannot conceive how men, who call themselves the ministers of religion, could countenance.

NEW CHURCHES.

It is gratifying to the churchman to find that he has so many subjects connected with our venerable hierarchy to introduce into a report of ecclesiastical proceedings for any single quarter. Since we last alluded to this important subject, the annual report of *Her Majesty's Commissioners for building New Churches* has been presented to the public. From that report it appears that two hundred and fifty-eight churches and chapels have been actually completed since the commissioners commenced their labours. Nineteen churches are also in course of erection: and plans for twelve more have been adopted. Besides the churches erected and in the course of erection, grants of money have been proposed towards building thirty-five others. Accommodation has been provided for 328,253 persons, including 174,270 free seats for the use of the poor. Much has been done also in assisting in the erection of churches, by the "Incorporated Society for Promoting the Enlargement, Building, and Repairing of Churches and Chapels." And yet, notwithstanding all these efforts, the cry is heard from every quarter, *build us more churches!* Can the dissenters, who pretend that the Church has lost the affections of the mass of the people, deny that churches are called for in almost every direction? Does the number of churches, or the number of persons within them, indicate any thing like an alienation of the affections of the people? Never was there a stronger feeling in the country in favour of our beloved church—the church of our forefathers—than at the present moment. Nor is it likely that this feeling will diminish: on the contrary, it is certain that the people will continue to raise their voice—and to raise it with so much effect, that the legislature will, at length, however reluctantly on the part of some, be compelled to grant the prayer of the country, and to take care that a church be erected and a minister appointed in every district in which the want of a church is experienced. The events of the last few years indicate clearly that the people are anxious that the blessings resulting from the attendance on divine worship in our churches, should be extended to every district, and town, and village, in which there may be an insufficiency of church accommodation. That dissent is gaining

ground is scarcely asserted by dissenters themselves: and facts prove that it is rather on the decline. We will submit a simple illustration of our position. Every one knows, that when once a church is built and opened for divine service, it is never closed but continues open. Can the same be said of dissenting chapels? By no means. We ourselves have known several that have been built, and after a few years they have been closed or devoted to some other purpose. Now in the statistics put forth by dissenters they take special care to enumerate in their lists every chapel that has been *built* whether it be used for worship at the time or the contrary. When, therefore, we are presented with an array of chapels erected within any given period, we would ask, how many of them are closed? how many are devoted to other purposes?

THE STATE OF OUR OLDER CHURCHES.

In connexion with the subject of church building, we would submit a few observations on the state of our old parochial edifices. It cannot be unknown to many of our readers, especially to clergymen, that various mutilations have been inflicted on some of our ancient churches, by churchwardens and vestries, under the name of repairs, or possibly for the sake of accommodating certain individuals with pews more agreeable to their wishes, than those in which their forefathers worshipped Almighty God. We are acquainted with a beautiful church in a country village, where are still to be seen the remains of an ancient stone screen of most exquisite workmanship, which has been partly destroyed, and partly concealed by a staircase, and a large pew, for the accommodation of the SQUIRE. Sometimes some of the most splendid specimens of ancient architecture are defaced, or altogether removed, by making some paltry alteration, which is conducted under the superintendence of men who are destitute of knowledge and taste, and see, perhaps, nothing but deformity in the workmanship of the ancients. We remember to have seen a most beautiful Saxon church, one, indeed, of the most beautiful in the kingdom, in which the tracery and ornamental work on the arches were completely hidden by the *whitewash*, which had been applied from generation to generation, under the direction of successive vestries and churchwardens. Not unfrequently windows are blocked up by the same *authorities*. Monuments are removed or mutilated, and various other depredations are committed under the plea or pretence of improvements. We have heard of one instance in which a beautiful window, at the west end of a parish church, was blocked up by the command of two farmers, who, at a vestry, illegally assem-

bled, had passed a resolution to that effect: and the only object, which they wished to obtain was the accommodation of some of the parishioners in playing the game of FIVES in the churchyard!

There are two other points connected with this subject, respecting which a few words may not inappropriately be introduced. We allude to the *baptismal fonts*, and the *screens* which formerly separated the chancels from the body of the churches. In not a few cases even the fonts have disappeared, while a small *bason*, or another *font* of small dimensions, has been substituted, so that were a parent to demand that his child should be immersed, as by the *rubric* he may demand, it would be necessary to introduce some other vessel for the purpose. And with respect to the ancient screens, few, very few remain in any part of the kingdom. They have also disappeared before the demon of innovation under the name of improvements and necessary alterations. Many of these screens were of most exquisite workmanship; and surely they ought to be preserved as monuments of our forefather's taste, and as memorials of their piety. On one occasion we ourselves saw the ancient *font* of a parish church used by the incumbent as a *trough* for his pigs: and we have often seen portions of ancient screens exposed for sale at various shops in London.

THE MAYORALTY.

We cannot but congratulate the friends of order and religion, on the result of the late contest for the office of chief magistrate of the first city in the empire. Of Mr. ex-Alderman Harmer we know nothing: but we do know something of the principles advocated in the "Dispatch." In our opinion the opposition was not levelled against Mr. Harmer, but against the principles so prominently put forth in a newspaper, of which he was the chief proprietor, and over which he could exercise a control. It was not possible to separate the paper from the man; nor can all the sophistry in the world induce an honest Englishman to believe, that the ex-alderman repudiated the principles, while he was deriving large supplies from the sale of the paper. We rejoice, therefore, at the decision of the Livery. We feel that a great moral lesson has been taught in that decision, which will not be lost upon the country at large. There is a feeling in the country which may not be outraged with impunity. Our people are not prepared to receive infidel sentiments: they view the Bible as a revelation from God: and they will not support men who, in any way, whether directly or indirectly, pour contempt upon the sacred volume.

HER MAJESTY AND THE PRINCESS ROYAL.

It would be somewhat out of place not to notice in our summary of matters connected with the religious and moral condition of the country, an event which has filled a whole nation with gratitude. Our most gracious queen is now entered upon a new relationship, in which we sincerely hope she may become an example to all the mothers in the land. On the birth of a child, the people are naturally reminded of those great principles on which the House of Brunswick has ever acted since their accession to the throne of these kingdoms. In the year 1688 a prince was born, who, on account of his father's rashness, lost his title to the crown, which, in consequence, passed over to the next heir, being *a Protestant.* From that period a Protestant prince has always reigned over Great Britain; and the laws of the land secure to us that inestimable blessing. It must, therefore, be a matter of sincere joy to a Protestant people, that our gracious queen should have given birth to an infant, to whom, in the absence of male heirs, the crown of these realms must naturally descend. Our queen has been educated in Protestant principles: she is the temporal head of our Anglican Church: her consort is a Protestant: and the infant princess must be trained up in the same principles. At a proper age she will be placed under the superintendence, with respect to education, of some prelate, who will instruct her in the doctrines and discipline of our Apostolical Church.

SOCIALISM AND CHARTISM.

Though Socialism and Chartism received a most serious check, in consequence of the efforts of the Bishop of Exeter, yet, in many parts of the kingdom, the emissaries of both the parties are actively employed in disseminating principles destructive to all moral and social relationships, and subversive of all order and government. We trust, therefore, that the attention of the public will be directed to the subject during the parliamentary recess, in order that they may be prepared to express their opinions to the legislature, if necessary, as soon as Parliament assembles. Meetings are held in most of our large towns, at which infidel principles are openly avowed. It is a fact, too, that these misguided men are endeavouring to train up the rising generation in the same pernicious views. Let, then, the respectable members of the community be on their guard: let all the lovers of social order watch the proceedings of the parties alluded to; and it will be competent for any persons who have obtained any knowledge on the subject, to petition the

Parliament, who may be called upon to apply a remedy to a disease, which, unless arrested in its progress, must issue in the ruin of all our settled institutions. We sound the alarm: let every man do his duty.

Ere we again make our appearance before the public, Parliament will undoubtedly have assembled, and in all probability we shall have occasion, in our next number, to dwell upon matters of the utmost importance, which will have been introduced to the notice of the legislature.

General Literature.

Tracts of the Anglican Fathers. Vol. I. London: Painter. 1840.

We are pleased, very pleased, to see this admirable series progressing, as our transatlantic friends have it. Many and many are the applications which have been made for these tracts: and we can assure the publisher that the patience of the public has been all but worn out. Now, however, we have a volume, a handsome volume, an orthodox volume, and a promise that every month we shall have a part containing four sheets. This will answer. We observed, a long time since, that had these Tracts appeared in 1833, the "Tracts for the Times" would never have appeared. The good which they have done would have been accomplished by the "*Tracts of the Anglican Fathers*," while the heart-burnings which have been occasioned in the Church would have been avoided. How many are there who condemn, *without reading*, the former series, who would have been *afraid* to condemn the latter; how many, who willingly vituperate Dr. Pusey, and think with a writer, of whom, however, they scarcely know the name, that

"Cortesia gli fu esser villano,"

who would never dare to call Cranmer popish, or Latimer unevangelical. Much as we differ from the Oxford Tractarians, we abominate the unchristian abuse which has been heaped upon them; and we think with that great and good man, George Stanley Faber, that the term "Puseyite" is an instance of the working of "unsanctified human nature."

But our present business is neither with the good qualities, nor the dangerous and, sometimes, heretical tenets of Dr. Pusey. We have now to speak of the "*Tracts of the Anglican Fathers.*" The first volume consists of Tracts concerning the Prayer Book and on the Authority and Commission of the

Church. The names of Cranmer, Nowell, Jewell, Lancelot Andrews, Bancroft, Laud, Charles I., Sanderson, Cosin, and Sparrow will sufficiently evidence both the kind of matter and the quality of style which we are to expect. The student of Anglican Ecclesiastical History and Antiquities will not be surprised to find Laud the antagonist of Popery, and King Charles the Martyr the advocate of the Church's rights; to find Cranmer advocating *high church*, though evangelical views, and the great lights among the Reformers supporting the same principles. But these things will occasion no surprise to *him*. They must necessarily startle the adherent of vulgar prejudices, who has been taught to believe that the Reformation was a renunciation of Church authority, that Laud was a papist in disguise, and Charles I. an arbitrary tyrant; who looks upon it as "a matter of opinion" whether he be a Churchman or a Dissenter, and conceives the sin of schism an imaginary offence, an ecclesiastical bugbear, raised up by a cunning priesthood to frighten fools withal. Such persons may be startled at this resuscitation of old and sound principles, but though startled, we trust that they may read and be convinced.

The object proposed by the conductors is to give four volumes of Tracts; and we perceive that the idea thrown out in the July number of this Review, as to the four-fold office of the Episcopate, has struck their minds. The first volume now completed, treats, as we have seen, on the Authority and Commission of the Church; the second volume will contain Tracts on Doctrine; the third on Discipline; and the fourth Practical Tracts: thus shall we have a very complete body of English theology, drawn from the most unsuspected sources, and exemplifying, with more or less minuteness, all the most important points of divinity.

There is one hint thrown out in the Preface, which we hope will not be allowed to evaporate in a mere half promise. It refers to the tracts of the ante-Lutheran Fathers of the English Church; and it is observed that a fifth volume of the series will give a few tracts from Elfric (or earlier) to Anselm, from Anselm to Bradwardine, and from Bradwardine to Tunstall of Durham. Most important would such a series be, though we opine it would require a hydraulic press to get it into one volume. It (the series, not the press) would prove a fact too often lost sight of in these days of liberal interpretation and private judgment, viz., that the Church of which we are members is not a *new* but a *reformed* Church; and that even at the time of her greatest darkness she was not distinctively *Romish*, when we see the contests carried on not only between the An-

glican Church in general and the Pope, but also between the sovereign Pontiff and particular Bishops, who were supported in their contest always by the national feeling, and generally by their Metropolitan. It would be needless to detail the particular dispute between John and his barons, among whom were not a few bishops, as to the Papal authority: but this is only one among many similar instances. Now we should be very glad to see this idea carried out, and our ante-Lutheran Church rescued from the charge so often attempted to be forced upon her. We know well, nor would we for a moment blink the fact, that the Church of that period was exceedingly corrupt, but still the distinctive characteristic of *Romanism*—the *Popery* of the Western Church—viz., the devoted, implicit adherence to the Bishop of Rome, was never any part of the system of our Anglican Church.

The Five Empires, an Outline of Ancient History—Englishman's Library. By Robert Isaac Wilberforce, M.A. London: Burns. 1840.

"EVANGELICAL Truth," "Apostolical Order,"—such are the objects which the writers of this series of "sound learning and religious education have taken upon them to support. With what success let the names of Gresley and Wilberforce, Churton and Melvill declare. The present is decidedly the best volume of the series.

The History of the Jews from the taking of Jerusalem by Titus to the present time. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd. 1840.

WHILE we speak in terms of praise generally of this work, we must not blind ourselves to the fact, that it is written in a spirit too much in accordance with the "philosophy" of the day. The information it gives, however, is both useful and extensive.

The Churchman's Guide; a copious Index of Sermons, and other Works, of eminent Church of England Divines, digested and arranged according to their subjects, and continued to the present day. By the Rev. John Forster, M.A. Incumbent of the Royal Chapel in the Savoy. London: Parker. 1840.

THE title of this work sufficiently explains its object: and we have only to add that its execution is equal to its design. We can scarcely conceive a more useful book for the clergyman. All the most important sermons, tracts, and other works, provided that they be not inconsistent in doctrine one with another, are here noted, and the churchman may depend upon the fidelity with which the selection is made.

The Whole Works of Richard Graves, D.D., late Dean of Ardagh, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin. 4 vols. Dublin: Curry. 1840.

If a strong mind, large attainments, sincere piety, and a most kind and christian deportment, be qualities that entitle their possessor to fame, then may the late Dean of Ardagh be well denominated famous; but a stronger claim to celebrity than even these could give, may he made in favour of Richard Graves. He has written on many subjects, and on all well. His work on the Pentateuch is used in the English Universities as well as in Dublin. And we may safely say, that it never has been perused without great benefit. Nor are his other works indicative of less ability, though their subjects have not brought them so prominently before the religious world. To enter now into a critical examination of works like those of Dean Graves would be absurd: the author has entered into his rest, and the writings have taken their place among the standard productions of English literature.

With regard to the present edition, we *may* say somewhat: for it is not only a complete and a handsome edition, but it is enriched, by the present Dr. Graves, with a memoir of his father. This memoir is valuable. It is true that, with the usual "pietas" displayed on such occasions, Dr. Graves depicts the late Dean in colours of celestial brightness; that he gives us the portrait of a faultless man, one who, to use the biographer's expression, "knew only by theory the carnal heart which is enmity against God."

While we regret to see this, first because it is injudicious, and untrue of *any* man, we are quite ready to grant that the late Dean Graves was a man of great innocence and simplicity of character; and we pronounce the memoir valuable, not so much on account of itself as on account of its object. For various reasons, we shall give here a sketch of the life of this distinguished scholar; and the reader will, as we proceed, see that the memory of such a man is, at the present time, peculiarly valuable.

Richard Graves, late Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin, was born on the 1st of October, 1763, at Kilfinnan, in the County of Limerick, of which union* his father was rector.

His father, who was a man of considerable taste as well as

* The English reader must have it explained to him, that an "union" in Ireland is the union of two or more parishes, which are thus permanently brought under one minister. We shall, on another occasion, speak of this system: the union in question was Kilfinnan and Darragh.

considerable learning, superintended his education during his earlier years, and he was prepared for the University of Dublin by an elder brother, who had already distinguished himself there. Letters are still extant which shew how pious and how affectionate was the intercourse between the father and the brothers of this amiable family; and from one of these we make an extract, to point out a remarkable fact, viz., that though there was more than one parish, there was NO church; and to prove, also, what may be done even under circumstances so discouraging, by an active and devoted clergyman. The letter from which we quote is dated Kilfinnan, Dec. 30, 1768, and was addressed to Thomas Graves, the elder brother of Richard, by their father.

"'For my own part,' he says, 'I have felt the want of a church more than ever at this sacred season. The late storms and constant wet weather, rendered our Market-house utterly unsafe for weak and sickly constitutions. So that I was obliged, on Thursday before Christmas-day, to administer the holy sacrament to eight persons at Bosnet's-town; the next day, to fifteen at Castle Oliver; on Saturday, to seventeen at Mrs. Crawley's; on the Nativity, to above ninety at the Market-house; on Monday, to ten at Sunville; and on Wednesday to eight at Bettyville. All these calls of duty I cheerfully obeyed, rejoicing in the Lord who gave the strength, and with heartfelt delight at the prospect of salvation for so many souls of my flock.'"

Mr. Graves held, at the same time, another union of three parishes; and, at the advanced age of seventy-three, was presented to another union of two parishes. Thus he was, shortly before the time of his death, the pastor of no fewer than seven parishes, viz., Kilfinnan, Darragh, Ballingarry, Dunmoylan, Castle Robert, Croom, and Adair; and, strange as it may seem, he nevertheless, never had a church of his own to officiate in.* At the age of eighteen the subject of our memoir entered as a pensioner of Trinity College, Dublin; and with a characteristic, but well-grounded confidence in his own powers, he said to his parents before leaving home, "I start for a Fellowship."

His career at college was one of uninterrupted success; and though for a time ill-health and the loss of his father, made it necessary to relax in his exertions, he obtained, at an unusually early period the distinguished honour of a Fellowship.

"His religious views contributed to the successful prosecution of his studies; though the contrary might, by a worldly reasoner, have been naturally expected. He was accustomed, on principle, to lay aside

* The memoir is very ambiguous on this point, speaking of the church at Kilfinnan, while the letter of Mr. Graves intimates, that if there were a church, it was not in sufficient repair for use: the latter was probably the case.

his studies on the Sabbath; though he saw many of his competitors regularly gaining that day a-head of him. But if he appeared to lose ground, he was, on the other hand, enabled (and it is his own remark) to return to his task, not only with renewed physical energy, but with a tranquillized spirit, free from all injurious anxiety, and cheerfully resigned as to the result."

An anecdote is related of his undergraduate course, which is well-worth preserving.

"He had shewn great abilities in the Historical Society, and on other occasions, previous to his appointment to a Fellowship. One of these, which occurred while he was an under-graduate, has been particularly mentioned to the writer. In the year 1783, a large number of students, excited by political disturbers, had assembled with the intention of expressing opinions in support of the proceedings of the delegates from the volunteers, who had met that year in Dublin. Believing it to be his duty, though he had not previously taken any part in politics, to protest against this movement, and having succeeded, though his appearance was unexpected, in obtaining a hearing, he exposed so eloquently the injury that would accrue to the discipline and character of the University from such a proceeding, and its total incongruity with their position as students, that resolutions were passed, directly opposed to those previously contemplated, and to the complete discomfiture of those agitators who had got up the meeting."*

His faculty of extemporaneous speaking he retained in after life; and on many occasions it was eminently useful to him.

In 1787 he took the degree of M.A., and married in the same year Elizabeth Mary, daughter of Dr. Drought, Professor of Divinity. This union was eminently happy, and the editor has given an interesting proof of the conjugal harmony that subsisted between his parents, by presenting the reader with a fac-simile of the Dean's autograph, in 1825, to the following effect:

"To Mrs. Eliza Graves, the best of wives and mothers, in testimony of Respect and Affection, uninterruptedly merited, during a union of nearly eight & thirty years, this Set of Books is presented by her most sincerely grateful
& attached husband,
RICHARD GRAVES."

"April 21—1825."

* The writer has been informed, on good authority, that shortly after the above occurrence, which produced some sensation at the time, a communication was made to him from those in authority, highly commending the principles and abilities he had displayed, and advising him to qualify himself, by adopting the legal profession, for rendering further support to government in a higher sphere. From this, had he been prompted by ambition, he might easily have fancied himself likely to be returned for some government borough to the Irish House of Commons—figuring among its orators, and crowned with political fame and power. But the above effort had been made in obedience to principle, not to ambition; and he was not to be tempted by any offers from the independence he was seeking, and the sacred profession he had chosen.

Dr. Graves kept no diary: his piety was of the most retiring character, and one only record of his religious feelings has been preserved (and that by chance) during the earlier portion of his life; this we would gladly extract, but refrain from want of space. It is, as his son denominates it, "an interesting document."

"This interesting document, the only private record of his views and feelings at that period, which has come into my hands, was found among some loose papers in his college rooms, by a relation, who happening to read it, begged permission to keep it, and after the author's decease kindly forwarded it to me. I have not found any document similar to the above, (which was thus *accidentally* preserved) till the series (given in the sequel) commencing in 1807, twenty years afterwards."

Previous to his marriage he was ordained, and entered on a course of duties as tutor in his College, where the amiability of his character, the depth and extent of his attainments, and the kindness of his manner, caused his classes to be more than unusually large. It is to be remembered also, to his great credit, they contained a large proportion of pupils, who not only received from him gratuitous instruction, but caused him in some instances considerable expense.

"But he proved in a still more important point his desire to benefit those, whom Providence placed in his way, by pursuing the plan, too little attended to at that time, of devoting one day in the week to the religious instruction of his pupils. It cannot be regarded as any other than a difficult and thankless task, to attract to religious subjects, the minds of young men just freed from the restraints of home or of school, and either entering the lists of literary fame, or still more eagerly starting in the heedless career of pleasure. And it can hardly be expected, if parents have neglected during its tender growth, to train the plant to the proper standard, that increasing years will render it more pliant."

His pulpit exhortations, too, were very effective; and amidst these varied engagements he found time to write an admirable treatise, to prove that the Apostles were not enthusiastic fanatics, but spake forth the words of truth and soberness.

In 1798 so disturbed was the state of Ireland, that Dr. Graves thought it necessary to retire for a time into England; he returned, however, to his post in the following year, and was elected a Senior Fellow of his College, taking in the same year the degree of D.D. In 1807 appeared his great work, the Lectures on the Pentateuch: a work which had well-nigh perished, together with its author, in the waves on the coast of Wales; for the vessel in which Dr. Graves and his family were proceeding on a second visit to the Principality, was nearly wrecked.

"In February, 1808, he preached in the College Chapel a sermon to show that 'Scriptural instruction should form a part of academic education.' This was delivered for the purpose of encouraging the students to profit to the utmost by the Saturday lectures in the Scripture, which were then for the first time set on a public and permanent footing; and the establishment of which he had been mainly instrumental in producing."

In 1813 he was presented to the Deanery of Ardagh, and to the Regius Professorship of Divinity at Dublin. The former preferment was bestowed upon him by Mr., now Sir Robert Peel; and though it involved considerable sacrifices, he willingly made them, with a view to render the divinity chair more useful.

"'Let me hope every thing is directed for the best, and that in this great change of my life I have followed the guidance of Providence, to make me serviceable to the interests of religion.'"

In Nov. 1817, he was called upon to sustain a severe domestic affliction in the loss of a son highly gifted, and equally amiable. Most important is that part of the memoir which relates to the Dean's withdrawing from the Bible Society. We can, however, only refer to pp. cxxxviii. to cxli.

We would also refer the reader to the Dissertation on Predestination, in which the Dean maintained, with all the gentleness of his nature, the doctrines of the Church of England. On this account he received insulting anonymous letters from students of the University, who oddly enough fancied themselves "evangelical," and the censure of Thomas Scott, who pronounced him "*wholly ignorant of the essential principles of the Gospel.*" These are instances of the "odium theologicum," which, however, existed not in the breast of Dean Graves; the account of the circumstances under which the dissertation was published, will be found in the memoir, pp. cxlix. to clxiv. This work was the last effort of his pen. In 1827, he had the misfortune to lose his wife, after which he retired from the duties of his Professorship; but he had not yet exhausted the cup of affliction: a few months after he lost a beloved daughter-in-law. A few months after that his aged brother was removed, and again another blow fell upon him in the death of a much esteemed son-in-law. Most interesting is it to read how the good old man bore up meekly and resignedly under all these afflictions till his own death, which happened rather suddenly on the 29th of March, 1829. For upwards of a year before his death his health had been declining, and he had lost the use of one side by a paralytic stroke. He appears, however, to have retained his mental faculties perfect till the time of his last seizure.

Thus have we given a sort of abstract of the life of a good and learned man; and have pointed out two or three portions of his history, to which we would gladly direct the attention of our readers. We think Dr. Graves has done a service to the Church by this elegant edition of his father's works; and happy will it be, if the sound judgment and true piety of the late Dean have their full effect upon his brethren in the ministry.

---

1. *The Horæ Paulinæ of William Paley, D.D.* By James Tate, M.A. Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's. London: Longmans. 1840.
2. *A Verbal Paraphrase of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, with brief Illustrations from Scripture and the Fathers.* London: Burns. 1840.
3. *Biblical Cabinet.* Vol. 27. Edinburgh: Clarke. 1840.

THE great importance of St. Paul, both as a witness to and a preacher of the Gospel, invest everything with which he is concerned with a peculiar interest. The Horæ Paulinæ of Paley proved the truth both of the Acts and of the Epistles by the continued undesigned coincidences which they display; but the chain of evidence was less strong than it might have been made on account of the order in which these Epistles were written not having then been satisfactorily ascertained. The links wanting have been admirably supplied by Mr. Tate in the first volume now before us: a volume which all who desire thoroughly to understand the apostolic history will do well to peruse with attention. Perhaps the most able of Tholuck's works is that which he wrote on the same subject, and we are glad to see it so well translated, as it is in the third volume on our list; while Mr. Bosanquet has, with great learning and diligence, applied himself to a paraphrase of what is, confessedly, the most difficult of the Apostle's writings. Mr. Bosanquet is a man of ability and great information; he is also an *evangelical high churchman*, and as such has he paraphrased the Epistle to the Romans.

A Review of Tradition as taught by the Writers of the Tracts for the Times. By the Rev. J. Jordan, B.A., Curate of Somerton, Oxon. London: Hamilton & Adams. 1840.

IT is pretty well known that we are no advocates for the "Tracts for the Times." We have, however, expressed our opinion that very few of their opponents are qualified for the work which they have taken up. The book before us is one which, had the writer waited till he could have written himself M.A., would, perhaps, never have appeared—and the world would have been no loser.

Narrative of a Three Months March in India, and a Residence in the Dooab. By the Wife of an Officer, in the 16th Foot. London: Hastings. 1840.

How few are there to whom the name of India does not bring some interesting reminiscence. Even if we have never visited that world of wonders, if we have no dear friend or near relative, who is, or has been, resident there, still does the very name bring to our minds wild legends of adventure, tales of tropical wonders, and deeds now monstrous and now heroic.

The little volume before us is of a remarkably pleasing character. The authoress saw more of Indian society, and under more favourable circumstances for observation, than the generality of those who have written thereupon, and the style reminds us not unfrequently of the late Miss Emma Roberts.

We hardly know any more vivid descriptions of Calcutta manners than those given us by this lady; and we would willingly make copious extracts; we can, however, venture only upon one or two. Calcutta Equippages.

"The Course, which is the Mall of the capital of Bengal, is filled with carriages and equestrians for two or three hours after sunset, and is graced by a tolerable sprinkle before his rise; but the European residents in Balcutter are apparently not so attached to early rising as those of drier districts: and I have heard many of the former remark that the morning air in Calcutta is too humid at most seasons of the year to be beneficial. In the evenings, however, every one turns out; but what a dreary business it is, few can conceive. Speaking from recollection, I should think that the Course is about a mile in length; but there is likewise a pretty drive near the glacis, and towards Chowringhee, the principal abode of the English gentry. For the space of perhaps a quarter of an hour, there is light sufficient to discern the faces of your acquaintances; but beyond that time all is obscurity, and you may pass your nearest relative unrecognized. In fact, during by far the greatest part of the year, the society of Calcutta literally drive out after nightfall, meeting the air (if there be a zephyr) at a moderate pace: but on the return, flying before it as rapidly as their horses and the crowd of carriages will allow."

An Indian dinner:

"On entering the dining-room, one is struck with the load of viands which crowd the table, over which a huge punkah noiselessly waves to and fro. Until the family approach, its motion is scarcely perceptible; but no sooner is any one within its influence, than it is pulled in a more energetic manner; and an immense relief is felt after the fatigue of walking from another apartment, and being for a few moments without this important requisite. Behind each chair, stands a whiskered, moustached, and turbaned domestic, with his arms closely folded across his bosom, or opened only to adjust the chair most con-

veniently as his master or mistress becomes seated, and to arrange a napkin, which he then places in the hands or upon the knee. A foot-stool is before each chair, and is an indispensable comfort to the Anglo-Indian.

"The lamp or candle shades upon the table are all provided with perforated covers, to protect them from the effect of the punkah; and over each wine-glass or tumbler (of which there are generally several to each person) are silver covers, as a precaution against flies and insects. I have seen a table covered with little brown grasshoppers, or perhaps with what more closely resembles crickets, to such an extent, that, being unaccustomed to the sight, it was difficult to touch any thing, as the plate was immediately invaded by them, and their motions were far too quick to be calculated upon. Occasionally, the fire-fly will cause some alarm to the stranger, when its bright glow is discovered amidst the folds of a delicate white muslin garment; but at the season when the white ants take wing, and are attracted by the lights, nothing can be more annoying than their intrusion. The flying bugs, too, are objects of abhorrence, both within doors and in the open air: their odour is most noxious; and if accidentally crushed in a handkerchief, or any article of dress, the scent can scarcely be got rid of. In driving, they are very apt to settle in the hair; than which few things can be more intolerable."

After this, we shall no longer envy the dwellers in tropical climates, their dearly-bought luxuries. Mrs. Ashmore tells an amusing story of the first importation of ice into Calcutta, which reminds us not a little of the incredulity with which the existence of such a substance was first heard by an oriental prince —and it also seems to illustrate the singular fact, that extreme and unexpected cold produces effects very like those of greater heat.

"We chanced to arrive in India almost simultaneously with one of the first importations of ice from America. It was most amusing to see the anxiety with which it was sought after. The deposits were only opened for a short time before sunrise, when crowds of coolies were in attendance to carry off the portions required by their employers: these portions were immediately enveloped in thick blankets and enclosed in baskets, which were carried off with all speed; but a very considerable quantity invariably dissolved before they could reach their respectives destinations.

"I watched two or three Ayahs crowding round a basket which had just arrived: they were all eager to touch the novelty; but immediately on feeling its extreme coldness, ran away exclaiming that it was "burra gurrum,"—very hot. A child, too, cried violently, and told his mamma that 'the English *glass* had burnt his fingers.'"

Mrs. Ashmore gives us some instances of "Thuggee," before which atrocity burking become a small offence, and before

whose most eminent professors, Hare and Williams must "hide their diminished heads."

"At Cawnpore one day we saw a considerable bustle in a thoroughfare near the cantonment, when on inquiring the cause, we were informed that a wretch had been discovered who had tempted children into his den with the promise of sweetmeats, and who had already acknowledged the murder of seven or eight. The people in authority, and mere spectators, were running in crowds to behold this monster; he, however, kept them at bay for a length of time, for, being armed with an axe, he was a dangerous opponent. His appearance was that of a Fakeer, and divested of clothing; his beard and matted hair alone covered his neck and shoulders. At length some people succeeded in getting upon his miserable hut, whence, by means of long spears and sharp instruments, they succeeded in forcing him, and he rushed out covered with blood, to be pinioned, and receive the reward of his crimes."

Thuggee is "a religion," a "denomination;" and though we have heard of Chartists and Socialists exalting their horrible "isms" to the same level with those of Baptists and Independents, we never yet heard of Bishopism or Burkism as a form of religion. In conclusion, as we have ourselves been very much entertained, so we can cordially recommend the volume before us.

The Hebrew Grammar of Gesenius. Translated from the Eleventh German Edition. By T. I. Conant. London: Ward. 1840.

This is a very useful book, and well printed; it deserves praise, too, for its correctness. Mr. Conant, who is the Professor of Hebrew in the Literary and Theological Institution at Hamilton, New York, and is justly considered one of the most eminent Hebraists in America, has added to the work of Gesenius a course of exercises, and a Hebrew chreestomathy. We have much pleasure in recommending the edition.

Emendations of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament. By Selig Newman. London: Wertheim. 1840.

This title must necessarily startle the reader; and, coming from a Jew, will hardly leave him in a state to judge fairly of the design. When, however, he comes to peruse the seventy-two pages, for that is all the extent of the publication, they affect no great doctrine, and certainly make clear many difficult passages. We purpose shortly to devote a paper to Old Testament criticism, and shall then return again to Mr. Newman's valuable work.

The City of Magyar, or Hungary and her Institutions. By Miss Pardoe, Author of "Traits and Traditions of Portugal," "The City of the Sultan," &c. &c. London: Virtue. 1840.

AMONG the many books of travel with which the literary world has of late years abounded, we have never met with one which, taken as a whole, has so much pleased us, as this work of Miss Pardoe's. We are, however, rather at a loss for the reasons which led her to adopt so incongruous and so incorrect a title. The *city* of the Magyar may be Presburg, but cannot be Hungary. Moreover, why two titles? It does very well for the romance writers of the "Minerva Press," to style a novel, "Heavenlietta, *or* the Mysterious Monk of the Midnight Hour;" but an "*or*" is quite unnecessary in a title-page of Miss Pardoe's. While we are about objections, we will finish with them at once, and thus get rid of the more disagreeable part of our duty.

We would remind the fair writer, that *liberalism*, though it may look philosophical, is not *really* so; and that *conservatism* is not only the more correct, but the more ladylike political creed. In saying this, we do not mean to tax Miss Pardoe with absolute radicalism; she is far too sensible a person for anything so absurd as that: but we find a tendency here and there developed, to sneer at crowns and ecclesiastical establishments, which we should gladly see absent. And now, having said all that we have to say in the way of blame, we turn, with great pleasure, to praise; and here we find much to occupy our attention.

Of all the nations of modern Europe, Hungary is, perhaps, the most interesting to an Englishman; and it is yet one which, till very lately, has been almost unknown. Mr. Paget led the way by a very excellent work, and what was there wanting Miss Pardoe has supplied. She had opportunities of seeing the best society of the country, and has given a very fair and unprejudiced account of a noble people. Presburg must be (at least, sometimes) a gay residence:

"The streets of Presburg, during the sitting of the Diet, present a constant scene of amusement. The well-packed britzska, with its Austrian postilion, gorgeous in orange cotton-lace and soiled feathers, its dusty travellers, and sleepy horses, is succeeded by the light calèche from Pesth, drawn by the *bauern*, or peasant's post, where the wild, wiry, eager animals, sometimes four abreast, and always rather tied than harnessed to the carriage, come rattling along the uneven streets, only to make way for the wicker waggons of the country people, laden with fruit, or corn, or other agricultural produce, and driven by a sturdy hind, whose broad-flapped hat of black felt is girdled by a wreath of worsted flowers, or adorned with a black feather,

or a sunflower, or a bunch of marigolds. Women, with gay-coloured cotton handkerchiefs bound tightly about their heads, and frequently barefooted, carrying wooden panniers at their backs, filled with melons or vegetables, pass every moment. Smart grisettes, with sandalled shoes, and their carefully-arranged hair shining like satin in the sunshine, thread their way among them; horsemen gallop in every direction; fiacres, filled with pretty faces, dart round the corners; monks with robes of black serge, and priests in cocked hats, elbow ladies in lace shawls and British muslins; and, amid the crowd, whirl along the coronetted four-in-hands of the magnates, filled with noble dames, and gay with their plumed chasseurs."

The political constitution of Hungary occupied much of Miss Pardoe's attention, and she has written with considerable clearness about it. The more, however, it becomes known, the less will it be found to resemble that of England, although this is a favourite idea with the Hungarians themselves. We must find room for an extract, which we beg to recommend to the attentive perusal of our reformed House of Commons:

"It were difficult, if not impossible, to define the feeling with which I found myself looking upon the scene presented by the Lower Hall of the Landhaus. It was on the occasion of a circular meeting; and the first circumstance that struck me, was the extreme order and business-like appearance of the whole assembly. No listless loungers, occupying a couple of chairs with their elaborate idleness; no boots, looking as though they had collected all the dust or mud of a great thoroughfare; no members sitting with their hats on, as if tacitly to express their contempt both for their occupation and their colleagues, were to be seen even in the unformal and undress meeting of the Hungarian deputies. . . . . .

"The crowd who thronged the lower end of the hall, and extended for some distance between the tables, was orderly and attentive; and the regularity with which the proceedings progressed was admirable; and, after all that I had been told on the subject of the 'semi-barbarous legislators' of the country, surprised me no little.

"During the speeches, many of the members took copious notes, from which some few of them afterwards declaimed; but the facility with which the majority deliver themselves in a language, which, although that of their native land, has, until very recently, been almost a dead letter among the upper classes, is surprising. They use little or no action, but speak volubly and energetically; and there are certain individuals in the chamber who render their speeches ornate by classical allusions and quotations, which, however, produce no effect, save *ennui* and impatience, as the patriotic Hungarians are anxious to rid themselves altogether of the dead languages in their debates. I could not help smiling, when a member for Croatia rose, and addressed the meeting in Latin, at the idea of the confusion which it would have caused in our House of Commons; and at the nervousness of many a worthy squire, who had flung down his lexicon to grasp a hunting-whip, if he were called upon to assist in legislating for his country, by

listening, for three-quarters of an hour, to a Latin oration, which would put both our universities on the *qui vive*."

We should be very glad to see the city of Westminster, so far as its legislative portion is concerned, re-modelled after the city of the Magyar: but Latin speeches are not likely to be understood by radical members; and the amusements of hissing, whistling, and crowing like a cock, are much more in accordance with *liberalism*, than clean boots and classical allusions. That point in which the Hungarian constitution differs most materially from our own, will be seen, by the following extract, to be, in Miss Pardoe's eyes, a decided advantage. We must say, that we consider it to be decidedly the reverse:

"In one respect the Hungarian people have the advantage of our own as regards their representation, no deputy being permitted to vote against the feeling of his constituency. I allude, of course, in making this assertion, only to the members for counties whose votes carry weight, those of the towns merely giving the individuals an opportunity of advancing their personal opinions, without influencing the measures of the house. Thus a deputy is not responsible for his vote, which is regulated by the voice of the county that he represents in the Diet.

"An instance of this popular privilege occurred during one of the first meetings which I attended. The *grief* before the house was that of Count Raday, while the Royal proposition was the levy of soldiers. The Liberal party were insisting on holding back the troops until the King withdrew his interference with the national right of freedom of speech in the Chambers; and the Government members were urging that the requisition should first be complied with, and the grievance afterwards discussed; when an eminent speaker in the Royalist interest rose and addressed the meeting wtth great eloquence; expatiated on the impolicy of refusing soldiers to the empire, who were as necessary to the well-being of Hungary herself as to the dignity of the King; urged that the question of Count Raday should not be suffered for a moment to induce discourtesy from the Chambers towards the Sovereign; and for upwards of half an hour advanced arguments, amidst the cheers of the Government party, which proved their satisfaction to be equal to his own zeal; when suddenly he concluded his address by saying—'These are my opinions, my principles, and my views. I cannot look upon the question in any other light. But I am instructed by the county which I represent to vote with the Opposition; and my vote must be registered accordingly.'"

Now before we remark upon this passage, we adduce one other to be compared with it:—

"The question has been repeatedly asked—'What are the inclinations of the peasant, and is he capable of estimating his position as a free member of a state and a citizen, having duties to perform to the community?'

"To this query no other honest reply can be given at this moment, than that from the defective nature of his education he is utterly incapable of so doing; and that, moreover, he inclines more to the Government than to the nobles; whose favourable dispositions towards him he cannot be brought to understand.

"It is, moreover, certain that the early training of a vast number among them is entirely destructive of mental vigour, and that a state of entire liberty would, with these, soon be degenerated into one of utter demoralization; others, again, are mere superstitious fanatics, and betray in all their actions and feelings the rudeness of their Asiatic origin."

Here, then, we have a mere assembly of *delegates*, men, as we see in the speaker referred to, frequently of eminent ability and high character; but that ability is neutralized, if we may use the term, and rendered inefficient by their being *merely* delegates: and these men are *governed* in their legislative functions by a class "utterly incapable" of estimating their own position as citizens. A fact like this, recorded too by so honest and intelligent an observer as Miss Pardoe, speaks volumes on the much discussed subject of representation.

Agriculture has not stimulus enough to make much progress; the value of land is comparatively small, and there is no cause why the farmer should seek after a better system of operations.

"It is not yet even in a condition of mediocrity; nor will this fact be by any means matter of surprise when it is remembered that the country is poor both in money and in credit; that it has little external commerce; that even its internal trade is restricted on some articles; that the demand for home-consumption is that of a needy and conparatively uncivilized nation, demanding necessaries rather than luxuries; and that the roads are bad, and the export taxes on the frontiers so high as almost to amount to a prohibition.

"All these circumstances combined naturally tend to paralyze the exertion of the farmer, who, however rich he may be in cattle and produce, can never, while they exist, aspire to become wealthy; he must be satisfied to do the principal part of his business by barter; and where all landed proprietors are alike overstocked, the inconveniences of such a system are too obvious to require comment."

Miss Pardoe will pardon us if we do not quite agree with her as to the actual condition of the Hungarian peasant; we are well aware that he has his grievances, though we think they have been much overrated. We have already seen how Miss Pardoe herself speaks of the political *capacity* of the peasantry, and we much fear that the *liberals* in the Hungarian Senate are not consulting their happiness in the attempt to invest them with larger political *powers*.

The condition of the nobility is another subject on which the

authoress of the "City of the Magyar" has expended much pains and she has given us a very amusing and, we must say, a very correct picture of their social state.

"There is no country under heaven where nobility is at so low a par; or rather perhaps I should say, on so unequal a basis; and I was so much amused by the classification lately bestowed on it by a humorous friend of mine, to whom I had frankly declared my inability to disentangle its mazes, that I will give it in his own words:—

"'The nobility of Hungary are of three orders—the mighty, the moderate, and the miserable—the Esterhazys, the Batthyanyis, and *id genus omne*, are the capital of the column—the shaft is built of the less wealthy and influential; and the base (and a very substantial one it is) is a curious congeries of small landholders, herdsmen, vine-growers, waggoners, and pig-drivers. Nay, you may be unlucky enough to get a *nemes* as a servant, and this is the most unhappy dilemma of all, for you cannot solace yourself by beating him when he offends you, as he is protected by his privileges, and he appeals to the Court of the Comitat for redress. The country is indebted to Maria Theresa for this pleasant confusion; who, when she repaid the valour of the Hungarian soldiers with a portion of their own land, and a name to lend it grace, forgot that many of these individuals were probably better swordsmen than proprietors; and, instead of limiting their patent of nobility to a given term of years, laid the foundation of a state of things as inconvenient as it is absurd.'

"I was immediately reminded by his closing remark of a most ridiculous scene, which, although in itself a mere trifle, went far to prove the truth of his position

"My readers are probably aware that none pay tolls in Hungary save the peasants; and it chanced that on one occasion, when we were passing from Pesth to Buda over the bridge of boats, the carriage was detained by some accidental stoppage just beside the tollkeeper's lodge, when our attention was arrested by a vehement altercation between the worthy functionary its occupant and a little ragged urchin of eleven or twelve years of age, who had, as it appeared, attempted to pass without the preliminary ceremony of payment.

"The tollkeeper handled the supposed delinquent with some roughness, as he demanded his fee; but the boy stood his ground stoutly, and asserted his free right of passage as a nobleman! The belligerent party pointed to the heelless shoes and ragged jerkin of the culprit, and smiled in scorn. The lad for all reply bade him remove his hand from his collar, and let him pass at his peril, and the tone was so assured in which he did so, that the tollkeeper became grave and looked somewhat doubtful; when just at the moment up walked a sturdy peasant, who while he paid his kreutzer, saluted the young *graf*, and settled the point.

"It was really broad farce. The respectably-clad and cumfortable-functionary loosed his hold in a moment, and the offending hand, as it released the collar of the captive, lifted his hat, while he poured out

his excuses for an over-zeal, arising from his ignorance of the personal identity of this young scion of an illustrious house, who was magnanimously pleased to accept the apology, and to raise his own dilapidated cap in testimony of his greatness of soul, as he walked away in triumph. Cruickshank would have had food for a *chief d'œuvre.*"

We would willingly go with the fair writer into an investigation of the Commerce of Hungary, her mines, her internal regulations, her tariff, but space forbids us: these are topics to which Miss Pardoe has devoted much attention, and has acquitted herself well.

We have now done, and we would earnestly recommend Bohemia to Miss Pardoe. She would give us a valuable work: and we would only caution her against *liberalism* and injudicious title pages.

Christ's Discourse at Capernaum, fatal to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. By George Stanley Faber, B.D. London: Seeleys. 1840.

THE name of Faber is a sufficient guarantee for soundness, and learning, and integrity. Dr. Wiseman is unfortunate in his theological positions: not only with regard to the positions themselves, but also with regard to the opponents he meets with. Now he is brought to the ground by a heavy blow from Dr. Whittaker; and when he rises again, it is but to encounter the uplifted arm of Mr. Faber. In the volume before us, the discourse of our Lord at Capernaum is shown to be fatal to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, on the very principle of exposition adopted by the divines of the Roman Church: remarks are added on Dr. Wiseman's lectures sufficiently clear to convince any but a Jesuit.

The Parables of Jesus Explained and Illustrated. By Frederic Gustav Lesco, Minister of St. Gertraud's Church, Berlin. Translated from the German, by the REV. P. Fairbairn, Minister of Salton. Edinburgh: Clark. 1840.

THIS volume forms the twenty-ninth of the Biblical Cabinet; the excellence of which we have noticed many times. We know of no publication so useful to the Christian minister: consisting almost entirely of translations from the German. It brings before the reader all the best interpreters of that learned nation, whose works are otherwise, to the majority of our countrymen, a sealed book.

Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern. By John Lawrence Von Mosheim, D.D., Chancellor of the University of Gottingen. A new and literal Translation from the original Latin, with copious additional Notes, original and selected, by James Murdock, D.D. Edited, with additions, by Henry Soames, M.A. London: -Longman and Co.; Cadell; Hatchards; &c. &c. 4 vols. large 8vo.

Dr. Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History has long been known as an ably-executed—perhaps the most ably-executed—work on that subject which has issued from the press. Hitherto, however, it has only been known in Great Britain and America through the medium of Dr. Maclaine's paraphrase, which has been reprinted in various cheap forms, and in numerous editions. Scholars, however, have for a long time been dissatisfied with Dr. M.'s work: and this circumstance induced Dr. Murdock to undertake the close and faithful translation, which we now have the pleasure to introduce to our readers. But Dr. Murdock is not a mere translator. He has added hundreds of notes; some containing biographical accounts of numerous ecclesiastical writers, either not noticed, or imperfectly noticed, by Mosheim; others relating to the history of ancient heresies; while others discuss or criticise the reasonings of Mosheim. All these notes, however, are drawn from the best sources, and greatly enhance the value of the original book. Dr. Murdock's version appeared at Newhaven, in Connecticut, we believe, about eight or ten years since, in three very large octavo volumes. From the just claims which this new translation has to the confidence of students of ecclesiastical history, the London proprietors of Dr. Maclaine's translation, or rather paraphrase, wisely determined to discard it, and to adopt the new and literal version of Dr. Murdock. They have been singularly fortunate in selecting for their editor, the Rev. Henry Soames, well-known in this country for his works on the Anglo-Saxon Church, and for his history of the Reformation in England. Besides prefaces to each volume, illustrative of various objects discussed by Mosheim, Mr. S. has supplied not fewer than ten chapters, which are introduced in their proper places. The new chapters treat on the conversion of Great Britain to Christianity, on the Anglo-Saxon Church, on the history of the Reformation in England and Scotland, the history of the Church of England, of Scotland, and of Ireland, during the latter years of the sixteenth century, and the history of the Church of England, with occasional notices of Scotland and Ireland, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the first forty years of the

present or nineteenth century. The complex chronological tables of Maclaine have been superseded by Vater's lucid and accurate synchronistical tables, continued to the present time. To these are added lists of Councils, Popes, the Archbishops of Canterbury, Armagh, and Saint Andrews, and a good general index in lieu of the indexes to each volume, which were given in the original Anglo-American work. On comparing Mr. Soame's beautifully and accurately printed edition with that of Mr. Murdock, printed at Newhaven, we think that Mr. S.'s additions would fill a good-sized octavo volume. Valuable as the Ecclesiastical History of Mosheim confessedly is, it has now received so many and such important accessions, it must henceforth supercede the paraphrastic version of Maclaine.

---

1. *The Christian System Vindicated against the most Specious Sophisms of Modern Infidelity.* In three Parts. By the Rev. Daniel Moore, B.A., of St. Catherine's Hall, Cambridge, and Assistant Curate of St. Bride, Fleet-street. London: Tyas. 1840.
2. *An Introduction to the Evidences of the Divine Origin of the Christian Religion.* In Question and Answer. For the Use of Schools and Young Persons. London: Nisbet. 1840.

THE first of these two works is one upon which we need say but little. It does well all that it professes to do; and it is, moreover, recommended by the highest of all possible testimonies, that, namely, of the University of Cambridge. The second is also good in its kind, and well adapted to the object it has in view.

---

1. *The Works of Josephus.* Nos. 7 and 8.
2. *Canadian Scenery.* Parts 8 and 9. London: Virtue. 1840.

THESE works are going on well. We have already expressed our favourable opinion of them, and we are happy here to record it again. They are rather improving than retrograding. The view of Jerusalem, in No. 8. of "Josephus," is very interesting.

The Illustrated Watts's Hymns. Nos. 1 and 2. London: Orger and Meryon. 1840.

THIS very pretty edition is under the management of Mr. Fletcher. We suppose that there will be some critical remarks by-and-bye. The illustrations are very good.

Ancient Christianity. No. 6. London: Jackson and Walford. 1840.

We shall speak more fully on this erroneous work when the whole is before us.

The Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh. By John William Bowden, M.A. In two volumes. London: Rivingtons. 1840.

THOSE who wish to see an able account of a man, whom all acknowledge to have been preeminently great, will do well to consult Mr. Bowden's Life of Hildebrand. That in many points he is, however, too anxious to defend the haughty and ambitious Pontiff we feel assured; and while we do not join those who call the Pope, Hell-brand, instead of Hildebrand, we nevertheless think the man who erected the temporal power of the Papacy on too unscriptural a basis, who pursued worldly aggrandizement to so great an extent, and who claimed so absolute a sovereignty over his temporal superiors, is hardly a fit subject for the praise of an *Anglican* Catholic. Mr. Bowden is, in effect, *writing up* the Church of Rome. We do not like to see an English clergyman the apologist of Gregory the Seventh. He was the stern, and able, and unflinching, and uncompromising, and *successful* antagonist of the rights of conscience, as well as the rights of princes; and while we would not slander his memory, we would leave the divines of his own corrupt church, corrupt chiefly through the power with which he invested it, to laud his career.

Collier's Ecclesiastical History. Vols. 5, 6, 7. London: Straker. 1840.

THIS valuable work is proceeding very satisfactorily; the sixth volume brings us down to the middle of Elizabeth's reign. We have not had time to cut open the seventh. Collier, as a nonjuror, had his prejudices; but it is impossible to read his history of the ecclesiastical events which took place in the reign of Elizabeth, without feeling how very impartial as an historian he is; and it is no less impossible to consult this present edition, without feeling how well Mr. Barham has performed his task. The publication of so valuable a book at a crisis like the present must be productive of good; for though there are not a few who would reject a fact, simply because Jeremy Collier states it, yet the leaders of these very people will have their views corrected, and *their authority* will correct the views of their adherents.

The Book of Amusement. Edited by Joseph Fearn. London: Southgate. 1841.

WE have just received the proof sheets of this book, which reflects great credit on Mr. Fearn's taste and ability.

The Life and Times to Montrose. By Mark Napier, Esq., Advocate. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1840.

It has long been known that the historians of his own day did injustice to the fame of the "Great Marquis," though it has been reserved for Mr. Napier to show the extent to which this was the case. This work is illustrated from original MSS., including family papers now first published from the Montrose charter chest, and other private repositories. It contains a well executed portrait of Montrose himself, another of his nephew and inseparable friend, Lord Napier, and fac-similies of the autographs of Napier, Montrose, and their ill-fated monarch, King Charles the Martyr. We have rarely read a work which has more interested us, and we purpose, on another occasion, to recur to its contents.

An Historical Sketch of the Protestant Church in France. By the Rev. John G. Lorimer. Edinburgh: Johnstone. 1841.

That this sketch contains much valuable information, it would be foolish to deny; and the parallel notices of the Church of Scotland add greatly to its usefulness, but it is written in a bitter spirit towards the Church, and indulges in a tone about Dr. Pusey which savours of anything but Christianity.

An Index of Prohibited Books by command of the present Pope, Gregory XVI. By the the Rev. Joseph Mendham, M.A. M.E.H.S. London: Duncan and Malcolm. 1840.

This catalogue, for which the Anglican Church is indebted to one of her most learned and indefatigable sons, is preceded by a very able preface. We recommend it to all *English* Catholics in order that they may better estimate the present spirit of *Roman* Catholics.

Specifications for Practical Architecture. By Alfred Bartholomew, Architect. London: Williams. 1840.

We have attentively examined this book, and it appears to us to be one of the greatest possible importance at the present juncture. That architecture is but little understood by the majority of architects, let the hideous things called new churches testify. Mr. Bartholomew writes sometimes affectedly, and sometimes proposes schemes that are hardly feasible; his "National College of Architecture," for instance: but, notwithstanding these defects, the book is a good one, and likely to be very useful, not only to architects, but to builders, masons, bricklayers, and carpenters.

Geraldine, a Tale of Conscience. By E. C. A. London: Dolmar. 1840.

THE work which we here notice will not be new to our readers. It is here complete: the three volumes being printed in one, in a smaller shape. We have already expressed so fully our opinions as to this book, that we need not now repeat them. The conclusion is melancholy enough, and as abundant in sophistry as the two previous volumes. We do, generally speaking, dislike religious novels; they are sad mixtures, and seldom edifying. What, therefore, we say of this individual work, we would apply also to its class.

The Illustrated Commentary. Vols. 1, 2, and 3. London: Knight. 1840.

AMONG the many commentaries which appear in this commentating age, we do not know a more pleasant or a more useful one than that which Mr. Knight has given us. It is, we believe, very well known, that the Commentary and the illustrations are those which were used in the "Pictorial Bible." Thus, then, those who admired that work, but thought it either too large or too expensive, may now provide themselves with both the notes and the pictures. It is a good idea, and we hope it will succeed; and succeed to a sufficient extent as to encourage Mr. Knight to put forth other books in the same style.

Narratives and Tracts. Series of Children's Books. Little Mary.

THESE are the titles of useful little books, published by Burns. We wish them well.

Bible Stories. The Child and the Hermit. Darton and Harvey.

THESE, also, are pleasant and good books for children.

AMONG the many pamphlets laid before us, we would especially direct our readers to an excellent little digest upon Mythology, by Mrs. Smith; to a Sermon on Education, by the Rev. F. W. Faber; and to a still more valuable essay on the same subject, by the Rev. Henry Hopwood, of Queen's College, Cambridge; to a most able and valuable tractate upon the present condition of the Scottish Church.

We have lying before us an address, delivered by the Rev. Dr. Rudge, to the New Zealand emigrants at the depôt, Deptford (Painter). It is distinguished by piety and good sense. May it be made useful.

Gregory VII.; a Tragedy: with an Essay on Tragic Influence. By R. H. Horne. London: Saunders and Otley. 1840.

We are hardly prepared to agree with Mr. Horne in his "Essay on Tragic Influence." We do not deny that, were the drama and *all its adjuncts* under proper management, it might be made eminently useful, but we despair of seeing that proper management brought into action. With regard to Gregory VII., we cannot speak in terms of very high praise. It falsifies history, and that without gaining any advantage; the diction is faulty, and the characters by no means well drawn. Moreover, we look in vain for any vivid bursts of poetry, any high and noble feeling, any strikingly dramatic situation. Mr. Horne has certainly mistaken his way when he betook himself to tragedy.

The Divine Economy of the Church. By the Rev. John Jebb, M.A., Prebendary of Limerick, and Curate of East Farley, Kent. London: Duncan and Malcolm. 1840.

Our space will not allow us to give our readers an analysis of this work, which is, however, very sound and orthodox. Mr. Jebb is a son of the late Bishop Jebb, and it would seem that he has inherited no small portion of that excellent prelate's spirit.

We have frequently received letters on subjects treated of in the "Church of England Quarterly Review," *subsequent* to the date of the numbers in which the articles alluded to appeared. Had they been sent earlier they would have been of great utility. In order to obviate this inconvenience in future, we shall give a list of some subjects on which we intend to treat in the ensuing numbers of the Review.

The Continental Reformation
Slavery in India and America
Church Music
Sepulchral Monuments
The Wesleyan Methodists
The Waldenses and Albigenses
The Colonial Church
The Present State of Science
China and her Prospects
The Calvinistic Controversy
Christian Metaphysics
The Poor Law
Religion and Manufactures
Numismatology, Phrenology, } Physiology in connection with morals.
The University of Cambridge
——————Oxford
——————Dublin
Continental Universities
Durham University
London ——————
Lives of the Popes
Thomas à Becket
Ecclesiastical History
Eastern Travel
Emigration

WILLIAM EDWARD PAINTER, 342, STRAND, LONDON, PRINTER.

THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Quarterly Review.

APRIL, MDCCCXLI.

ART. I.—*Records of Wesleyan Life.* By a LAYMAN. London: Hamilton and Adams. 1840.

2. *The Centenary.* By THOMAS JACKSON. London: Mason. 1839.

3. *Wesleyan Methodism, Considered in Relation to the Church; to which is subjoined a Plan for their Union and more effective Co-operation.* By the Rev. RICHARD HODGSON, M.A., Evening Lecturer of St. Peter's, Cornhill. London: Hatchard and Son. 1841.

LIVING among us, agreeing generally with our Church in doctrine, and affording her political support, while at the same time they withhold from her ecclesiastical allegiance, there is a body of men, important both from number and intelligence; yet this body is, strange to say, less understood and less fairly appreciated than any other class of dissidents. There is no difficulty in ascertaining their doctrinal views—for they have their standards of interpretation; or their opinions and practices as to discipline—for they have their fixed and unvarying rules; or their politico-religious sentiments—for they have their official organs. Yet, while they far outnumber all the members of other "*denominations*" united—while they are equally superior to them both in intelligence and Christian feeling—and while also, by their system of union and centralization, their importance is indefinitely greater, there are yet comparatively few out of

their own communion who know what the Wesleyan Methodists believe, or how they reduce their faith to practice.

The reason of this is manifest. Their doctrine, whether correct or not (and into this we shall presently enquire), is systematic —it is worked into a whole; it is not a mere accumulation of separate and independent articles; it is capable of being studied —for no man among the Wesleyans makes his creed for himself. Again, their form of internal government is both complicated and sagacious: it is not the hasty fruit of excitement, neither is it the bitter fruit of enmity; it is not to be understood without some trouble: and hence, because the members of the Church have rarely had occasion to investigate the Methodist polity with the attention it requires, few of them know more than that there is such a body as that of the Wesleyans—that it is both numerous and powerful—that it takes its denomination from John Wesley—that its ministers travel about, at stated times, from place to place—that they wear neither gown nor surplice —and that their sermons are, without exception, extempore. When, however, we learn that there are of this denomination, in England alone, upwards of 300,000 individuals, and that they have very lately celebrated the first centenary of their corporate existence; that they possess 3,000 buildings for public worship; that these are so secured that, without the consent of the whole body, not one of them can be appropriated to other purposes; and that among their ministers—all for the most part well educated—there are not a few highly accomplished theologians; we shall see that a consideration of their history and system will be by no means a misemployment of either our time or that of our readers.

We need not here enlarge on the fact—which we have proved amply in the four preceding numbers of this Review—that the great revival of religion in this country, which commenced in the middle of last century, was a simple outpouring of God's Holy Spirit upon the nation; that it began within the pale of the Church, and that its progress was not less extensive, though more quiet, among Churchmen than among Dissenters.

When, therefore, we are told that the Church owes her present state of efficiency to the workings of Methodism or Dissent, in any shape, we utterly repudiate the assertion, as both incorrect in point of fact, and not seldom dictated by an ungodly spirit of rivalry. To Wesley himself and his first associates we give all due honour, for they were both good and able men; and had he continually resisted the schismatic spirit which grew up among his followers, and ultimately cut them off from the Church, we should not have hesitated to inscribe his name on the roll of

Reformers as second only to Luther. As it was, he placed himself in a remarkably anomalous position: he allowed his followers to become schismatic, while he never became so himself; sanctioned one line of conduct by his permission, and another by his example; and lowered his station from the lofty one of a Reformer of the Church to the unhappy one of the leader of a sect.

From these introductory remarks it will be easily seen, first, that we consider the Wesleyans as a highly respectable body of well-informed and well-principled men; but that, in the second place, we also view them as being in a state of schism. Yet their very schism is tempered with Christian feeling; and very earnestly do we wish that the observations and the occasional strictures which we shall make upon their polity and discipline may be received by them in the same spirit in which we offer them. Would that we could persuade some among them to return to the *visible* Catholic Church.

Religious differences are all resolvable into heresy or schism. Now it is possible for a person to be a heretic and not a schismatic—it is possible also to reverse this case, and to be a schismatic without being a heretic. Heresy is a corruption of the faith, and the danger of it is, therefore, measurable by its extent. The man who, like the late Dr. Adam Clarke, disbelieved the doctrine of the Saviour's eternal Sonship, is heretical; and so was he considered by the Wesleyan body: and the contrary position ably maintained by Mr. Treffry. But the heresy is of a widely different character from that of the man who denies the *divinity* of the Saviour. The guilt, therefore, as well as the danger of heresy, varies according to the character of the doctrine corrupted; but the sin of schism, which consists in separating from the Church Catholic, is always the same. Nay, the nearer the doctrines of the schismatic person or body approach those of the Church, or that branch of the Church from which he or they have separated, the greater the *guilt*. There is no inconsistency in this statement: the same *sin* will have one degree of guilt in one case, another in a different case; and as the Wesleyans themselves will allow that those who differ much from the Church are dangerously in doctrinal error, so we must be permitted to add that those who separate, or willingly remain separate, from her (their doctrinal differences being little or nothing), are needless guilty of the sin of schism.

We have said that heresy and schism are not inseparably connected: we have heard of more than one bishop of our Church, in days past, who entertained very lax views as to the doctrines of grace (we do not mean the doctrines of Calvin)—of

one who even doubted the divinity of the Saviour; yet, though heretics, they did not promulgate their heresy; they refrained from breaking the unity of the Church—such men were *non-schismatical heretics.* The Wesleyans, on the other hand, are orthodox in doctrine, but because they abide not in the unity of the Church we consider them *non-heretical schismatics.* That they speak with kindness of the Establishment, and act towards it the part of Conservatives, is a notorious fact; that many (perhaps the major part of them) repudiate the title "*Dissenters,*" is equally true; and that they have, on many, very many occasions, displayed a sincere love of the Church and a nobly Christian spirit, in spite of their separation, it would be unjust and impolitic to deny; but all this amiable feeling, all the admirable patriotism of their political conduct, all the learning of their ministers, all the merits of their constitution, and all the success of their system, do but place them in a situation the more conspicuously schismatic.

But we will now proceed to take a glance at the Wesleyan polity, and then we shall be better able to estimate what we maintain to be the false position of the body, and also to understand the arguments which the advocates of Methodism advance on its behalf.

This polity has now stood the test of upwards of a century, and we think that it must be fairly allowed to be a masterpiece of sagacity. It is adapted for the age—an age in which ecclesiastical discipline is virtually extinct; and it contains elements within itself of either relaxing or making more stringent that discipline, according as circumstances may seem to require. It contains nothing that ever appears superfluous, nor does it want anything that its members may consider essential. Do they choose a form of prayer, the constitutions of Methodism hand them the Anglican Liturgy. Do they prefer extemporaneous devotion, the same constitutions authorize them to do without it. Do they like the calm logic of a well-ordered discourse, they have their Buntings, and their Newtons, and their Lesseys. Do they prefer the admixture of a little buffoonery, there is Farmer William Dawson to accommodate them. We may carry this parallel further, for Daniel Isaacs remarks (in a work, be it observed, suppressed by the conference), that a man may be either a Churchman or a Dissenter, and does not cease to be either the one or the other because he is a Wesleyan Methodist. Nay, more, we may conclude the picture by observing that even the apostolic succession is claimed by many of the ministers, and believed in by many of the members; and, if *presbyterian orders* be valid, they are decidedly in the right.

Now, with this latitude of opinion and practice, the Church has nothing in common; her forms are all adapted to the strictest state of discipline, nor *can* they be made applicable *to any other* state. The faults, therefore, of the day are in favour of Wesleyanism, and in opposition to the forms of the Church Catholic. We do not mean to assert that Methodism favours those faults, but simply that it consists with them: that it was framed for the age; that it exhibits, in fact, the germs of rationalism—not, indeed, fully developed, but yet here and there discoverable by an eye accustomed to look on Christian antiquity.

But the practical wisdom of Wesley, who unquestionably never *meant* to introduce rationalism into his system, was well aware that if the structure of which he was the founder was to endure, there must be introduced into it two principles, which are wanting in all other sects; these were, centralization and freedom from democratic control. The manner in which he succeeded in introducing these essential principles of durability is, perhaps, one of the most remarkable instances of sagacity that the world ever saw; nor is it easy to say whether deserves greater commendation—the *clearness* of intellect which planned, or the *power* of intellect which carried into execution the plan of the Methodist establishment. To preserve his followers from the continual changes which popular influence necessarily occasions, he vested the whole government of the body in the conference, a yearly assembly, consisting legally of a hundred senior preachers, but by courtesy of all who have been preachers four years, and can conveniently attend. The business of this assembly is both legislative and executive; it decides on all matters brought before it, and from its decision there is no appeal; it stations the preachers in the various circuits throughout the empire, regulates the missionary and financial proceedings of the year; and is, in fact, the parliament of the connexion. Like the general assembly of the Church of Scotland, it represents, say some, a collective episcopacy, for it both examines and ordains. The president of the conference is the first man in the Wesleyan body, and he retains through his year of office not only a priority "*inter pares*," but also the authority, to a great degree, of the conference itself; he is exactly in the same ecclesiastical condition with the moderator of the general assembly. The empire is divided into districts, and these again into circuits, of which, in the United Kingdom, there are 408, and abroad 156 missionary stations; but it must be remembered that Ireland and Canada have their own conferences, and that in the United States the Methodists are not a presbyterian, but an episcopalian body.

The districts of which we have spoken are very large tracts of land, often embracing more than one county: thus, *e. g.*, Taunton and Bridgewater are in the Exeter district. The affairs of the district are managed by a district meeting, of which the chairman is always a travelling preacher and the superintendent of a circuit, usually the chief circuit in the district. Here, also, commences lay influence, the conference being composed of preachers only, while the district meeting allows the introduction of some few others. Among other powers and duties of this meeting, it reports to the conference proper persons for ordination. The districts are subdivided, as we have seen, into circuits, usually comprehending one or more large towns; but in cases where towns or cities are very large, as London, Manchester, Bristol, &c., then it is divided into several circuits: each circuit contains several chapels, and is supplied by two or more ministers, one being the superintendent, and the other or others labouring under his direction, according to a fixed plan, which is printed and sold at a low rate to the members of the society. In addition to the travelling preachers, who may be denominated *the regular clergy* of the connexion, the chapels are supplied by what are called local preachers, persons usually in trade, who, having been a certain time "on trial," and approved by the quarterly meeting, are allowed to preach and read prayers, but not to administer the sacraments.

"Thus we have (say they) the collective episcopacy in our conference; the archdeaconry, with its archdeacon, in our district and chairman; the rector and curate, in our superintendent and assistant; and the parish, in our circuit." The regular preachers are all itinerant, nor are they allowed to remain, under any circumstances, more than three years in one circuit: two years is the regular period, but an additional year is granted at the request of the circuit, addressed to the conference. The effect of this regulation is twofold; for the ministers are, in the first place, removed from undue influence on the part of the societies; and, in the second place, an entire unity of doctrine and discipline is promoted: for if one preacher varies from the rules and teaching of the standard authority, his deviations will be corrected by another; and, indeed, the knowledge of this fact renders such deviations exceedingly rare. We have our objections, and those grave ones, to the system of itinerancy; but we shall reserve them till we have completed our account of the Methodist polity. We have seen the counterparts—we ought rather to say, substitutes—of the bishop, the archdeacon, the rector, and curate; we shall now show those of the priest

and deacon, a distinction by no means unknown in the Wesleyan body. This may appear somewhat a strange assertion, when we find Mr. Watson, in his "Life of Wesley," declaring, concerning the Church, "We have no respect at all to her exclusive claims of divine right, or *her three* orders of ministers" (p. 333). Nevertheless, it will be found that these three orders do practically exist among the Methodists. The episcopacy is made to reside in the conference, as no number of preachers otherwise than *thus* assembled would be allowed to make a travelling preacher; the priesthood is reserved for those travelling preachers who are in what is called "full connexion;" and the diaconate belongs to those who have not yet attained that distinction—that is, who have not travelled four years. The distinction is singularly parallel with that of the Church. The junior preacher is not allowed to be superintendent; nor is the deacon able, *while so*, to hold a benefice: the junior preacher is not allowed, *by himself*, to administer the Lord's supper; nor is the deacon in the Church.

Hitherto we have seen the hierarchy; we must now look to the laity: and we find the societies divided into classes, meeting weekly, each "class" being placed under a leader, an individual chosen with regard to his religious attainments. His or her duty was, in the first place, to *visit* all the members of the class in the course of the week; but when that was, from many causes, found impracticable, the present plan was substituted; and now the class meet the leader at a place and hour regularly fixed. The object of this institution was to encourage, by Christian communion, an advance in spiritual holiness. How far it has succeeded, we shall by and bye enquire. Besides the class meetings, there are also "band meetings," smaller in number, subject to no leader, and consisting of persons of the same sex, in the same condition of life (as married or single), and as near the same age as convenient. Class membership is the test of Church membership. He who is a member of no class, may, indeed, attend Wesleyan preaching, and approve of Wesleyan charities, but he is not a Wesleyan himself. The minister meets every class once a quarter, and gives to each member a ticket, which is a token of being a member of the society: the ticket contains merely a text of Scripture, and the initials of the person who gives it. This ticket is paid for according to the means of the individual, and the produce goes to the general expenses of the society.

We proceed now to the celebration of public worship; nor do we at all fear that the detail will be tedious to our readers, for so remarkable are all the circumstances connected with this

extraordinary body, and so directly do they bear upon the state, both past and present, of the Church, that none can fully judge of the one, who is totally ignorant of the other.

It was not till after a long struggle with his societies, that Mr. Wesley consented, in 1770, to have public worship in his chapels at canonical hours: and thus took the first step in schism. It is true, he began by restricting his permission to cases in which the minister was wicked, or the church too far off for convenient attendance. But most true is it, that, as Bishop Copplestone remarks, the beginning of schism, like that of sin, is as the letting out of water; and under whatsoever pretext a commencement be given it, it will speedily do its full work.

The service in the Wesleyan chapels is now conducted in the following order: either the morning prayer of the Anglican Church is read, or an abridgment of it by Mr. Wesley; then a hymn is sung; then an extempore prayer is offered up; and then follows a sermon, also extempore. A reading-desk is provided, as well as a pulpit; and the prayers are not unfrequently —nay, we believe generally—read by some member of the congregation, instead of by the minister. A considerable difference prevails in different chapels as to the order of the morning service: in some, the morning prayer is read (the communion service is invariably omitted); in others, Mr. Wesley's abridgment is used; while in others, both are discarded, and, save that the lessons appointed by the Church are *usually* read, the worship is conducted as among Independents; the difference being, that the minister himself gives out the hymns, and that the congregation stand to sing and kneel to pray. The slovenly and indecent practice of other sects is very properly objected to, as much by the Wesleyan Methodists as by the members of the Church. The administration of the sacraments is managed according to the ritual of the Church; and the Lord's supper is administered in the evening, partly because it was thought more in accordance with primitive custom, and partly that those who were so disposed might receive it at church.

It remains now only to speak of the services more peculiar to Methodism: and these are, the Covenant, the Watch-nights, and the Love-feasts. The first of these solemnities takes place on the first Sunday afternoon in the year, and it is called, a renewal of the covenant between God and his people. Of the idea, there can be but one opinion; nor does it appear that there is anything objectionable in the mode of celebration. The Watch-nights, of which the chief is on the last day of the year, are evening services: a pause ensues a little before twelve

o'clock, and then a hymn is sung, expressive of gratitude to Almighty God for having preserved the worshippers to see the commencement of a new year; after which, the meeting disperses. The Love-feasts were intended to be a revival of the ancient Christian *agapœ:* they are prayer meetings held at regular periods. Small buns and water are handed round to the pews, and at intervals hymns are sung; and any person present, who thinks it expedient, rises and relates some passage of his own Christian experience. These meetings are invariably presided over by a travelling preacher; and those who most admire the earlier customs of Methodism lay great stress on the importance and advantage of Love-feasts.

From the mode of celebrating public worship, we are led, by an easy transition, to the doctrines of the Wesleyans; and here an attentive examination will leave us but little to blame. They profess to receive the doctrinal articles of the Church, and so honestly do they abide by their profession, that they might safely acknowledge that "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith;" for whether they admit her authority or not, they do, at all events, agree in her decisions. So little, nevertheless, do Churchmen know about them, that even some of our most eminent prelates have written anything but correct statements concerning Wesleyan belief. Now the standard of their creed is the mass of Wesley's own writings, but more particularly the first five volumes of his sermons, and the minutes of his conversations in conference. Hence it is easy to convict a Methodist preacher, or a Methodist writer, if he attempt to shift the ground of argument; the creed of the body is as definitely stated and as clearly defined as that of the Romanist by the Council of Trent. But as it would be a waste of time to enter into all the ignorant charges that have been made against the Wesleyans, in matters of doctrine, we shall confine our attention to three, viz., Justification by Faith, Predestination, and Christian Perfection. Now the first of these is so repeatedly insisted on by Wesley himself, as to leave scarcely a handle for objection. Yet there seems pretty generally to exist, among other sectarians, the notion that the body hold the contrary doctrine, viz., that of Justification by Works; and, moreover, that Wesley himself having once been surprised into an admission of the truth, the conference have, so far as in them lay, suppressed the document wherein it is to be found. We have ourselves seen this document (the original), and have been assured, that if the conference could obtain it, they would infallibly destroy it. If, however, the reader will turn to "Watson's Life of Wesley," p. 236, he will find it *printed,* together with a

note from Mr. Shirley, expressing his complete satisfaction with the scriptural character of the Wesleyan doctrine. We extract them both:—

"Bristol, August 9, 1771.

"Whereas the doctrinal points in the minutes of a conference, held in London, August 7, 1770, have been understood to favour Justification by Works. Now the Rev. John Wesley and others, assembled in conference, do declare, that we had no such meaning, and that we abhor the doctrine of Justification by Works, as a most perilous and abominable doctrine. And as the said minutes are not sufficiently guarded in the way they are expressed, we hereby solemnly declare, in the sight of God, that we have no trust or confidence but in the alone merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ for justification or salvation, either in life, death, or the day of judgment. And though no one is a real Christian believer (and consequently cannot be saved) who doeth not good works, where there is time and opportunity; yet our works have no part in meriting or purchasing our justification, from first to last, either in whole or in part.

"Signed by the Rev. Mr. Wesley and fifty-three preachers."

MR. SHIRLEY'S NOTE.

"Mr. Shirley's Christian respects wait on Mr. Wesley. The declaration agreed to in conference, the 8th of August, 1771, has convinced Mr. Shirley he had mistaken the meaning of the doctrinal points in the minutes of the conference held in London, August 7, 1770; and he hereby wishes to testify the full satisfaction he has in the said declaration, and his hearty concurrence and agreement with the same.

"Mr. Wesley is at full liberty to make what use he pleases of this.

"August 10, 1771."

So much for the wish to suppress. But as we have some objection ourselves to make to the Methodist doctrine, inasmuch as it appears to us that they err in the contrary way, we shall extract a few passages from an admirable sermon preached by Dr. Bunting, in which the doctrine of Justification by Faith was given him as a theme, and the sermon published by the desire of the conference, before whom it was preached. This, then, may be regarded as an official document. The Doctor observes:—

"The subject which is to be brought under your consideration this evening was not chosen by me, but officially allotted to me. It is the doctrine of Justification by Faith—a doctrine so often explained, and to most of you already so perfectly familiar, that you cannot reasonably expect from me, either any new illustration of its import, or any new argumentation in its defence. My sole object will be to state, in as clear and condensed a form as I can, those views which we, as a body of religious people, conceive to be most scriptural, respecting this essential article of the Christian faith."

We look first, then, to the definition of Justification, and we find that here, as throughout the discourse, the preacher's object is kept in view, namely, to give not merely his own views, but those acknowledged by the Wesleyan body:—

"We now come to the question, what is meant by the *justification* of a man in these circumstances? I answer, that to justify a sinner, is to *account* and consider him *relatively righteous*, and to *deal* with him *as such*, notwithstanding his past actual unrighteousness; by clearing, absolving, discharging, and releasing him from various penal evils, and especially from the wrath of God, and the liability to eternal death, which, by that past unrighteousness, he had deserved; and by accepting him as if just, and admitting him to the state, the privileges, and the rewards of righteousness. 'To be justified (say the minutes of the Methodist conference in the year 1747), is to be pardoned and received into God's favour; into such a state, that, if we continue therein, we shall be finally saved.'

"Hence it appears, that, in our opinion, justification, and the remission or forgiveness of sin, are substantially the same thing."

This last remark is carried out as follows:—

"I may here observe, in general, that God, in his act of justification, *designs*, and if the blessing be not forfeited, its *final effect* will be nothing less than, the removal of the whole curse brought on us by sin, and our restoration to an ultimate condition as good, at least, as would have resulted even from continued innocence."

We now come to the subject of Faith—and here we have a most satisfactory passage, and one which Dr. Bunting, feeling as he did that no Wesleyan would call it in question, takes the opportunity of corroborating, not by Wesley's works or the minutes of conference, but by the eleventh Article of the Church of England:—

"We are not justified, in whole or in part, by the merit of our own *works*, whether past, present, or future. Justification by faith in the merits of Christ is directly opposed to justification by what some have called our 'sincere though imperfect obedience.' The ground of our pardon, we have seen, is the atonement made for our sins; an atonement effected, not by our obedience, however sincere, but by the blood of Jesus. As no obedience which we have rendered, or can render, comes up to the full and righteous requisitions of the law of innocence, by that law we can never be justified. 'We are accounted righteous before God (says the *Church of England*, in her eleventh *Article*), only for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ, by faith: not for our own works and deservings.'"

Not less orthodox are the views of this able writer in the detail of his subject: we quote his statement of the three *causes*

of justification, viz., the originating cause, the meritorious cause, and the instrumental cause:—

"1. The *originating cause* is the grace, the free, undeserved, and spontaneous love of God towards fallen man. He remembered and pitied us in our low estate; for his mercy endureth for ever. 'After that *the kindness and love of God* our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us. *The grace of God* bringeth salvation. We are justified freely by his *grace*.'" (Titus ii. 11; iii. 4, 5; Rom. iii. 24.)

* * * * * * *

"2. Our Lord Jesus Christ is the sole *meritorious cause* of our justification. All he did, and all he suffered, in his mediatorial character, may be said to have contributed to this great purpose. For what he did, in obedience to the precepts of the law, and what he suffered, in satisfaction of its penalty, taken together, constitute that mediatorial righteousness, for the sake of which the Father is ever well-pleased in him."

In speaking of the instrumental cause of justification, Dr. Bunting very properly clears the doctrine from the meshes of Calvinism, and puts it on its only proper basis:—

"3. The *instrumental cause* of justification:—The merit of the blood of Jesus does not operate *necessarily* so as to produce our pardon as an immediate and unavoidable effect, but through the instrumentality of *faith*.

"The faith by which we are justified is *present* faith—faith actually existing and exercised. We are not justified by *to-morrow's faith foreseen;* for that would lead to the Antinomian notion of *justification from eternity;* a notion which to mention is to confute. We are not justified by *yesterday's faith recorded* or *remembered;* for that would imply the opinion, that justification is irreversible; an opinion which I have already assigned some of our reasons for rejecting. The justification offered in the Scriptures is a justification *upon believing*, in which we are never savingly interested until we believe, and which continues in force only so long as we continue to believe. On all unbelievers the wrath of God abides. The atonement of Jesus was indeed accepted, *as from him*, at the time when it was offered; but it is not accepted, *as for us*, to our individual justification, until we individually believe, nor after we cease to believe."

So far nothing can be more orthodox; but Dr. Bunting is the fair representative of the body, one of whose chief managers he is, and we must go on a little further, and we shall find the doctrine of imputed righteousness taught.

In this particular we are well aware that many members and ministers of our own Church will coincide with the Wesleyans; but we would ask them, one and all, where is the doctrine inculcated in Scripture? where is it to be found in the writings of

the primitive Fathers? where in those of our *chief* Reformers? We are, indeed, repeatedly told, that faith is counted—or imputed, if the term pleases—to us for righteousness; that we are counted or imputed righteous before God through the blood of Christ; but nowhere that his righteousness is imputed unto us. Let us examine the theory, and show, not only its error, but its uselessness. What is it to be justified? It is to be made or accounted just. Now there are two ways by which a man may be justified with regard to his fellow men; one is by proving that he is innocent, the other by paying the penalty of his transgression. A has defrauded B, or rather is supposed to have defrauded B. A stands in need of justification before B. The case is tried, and A's innocence becomes apparent: he is therefore justified; or, on the other hand, he is compelled to make good the injury he had inflicted on his neighbour; and is therefore *made just*, or *justified*, against, perhaps, his inclination. Again, the case requires punishment, it may be even death; and as the law invariably supposes that the punishment is equivalent to the offence, by the punishment the offender is placed once more in the condition of a *just man*—that is, he is *justified*. Nay, so universally was the word so understood in days past, that it was a delicate periphrase to say, instead of such an one was *hanged*, that such an one was *justified*. Now let us apply this reasoning to the case of the penitent sinner, and his justification before God: here it is obvious that there is but one means by which *this* justification can take place, for the man *cannot* be proved innocent; and if he be justified by bearing the due penalty of his offences, then he can only be justified by being damned. Out of this dilemma has Christ our Lord brought us; upon him was laid the iniquity of us all; and we are therefore justified before God through the blood of Christ. Hitherto, then, we have seen nothing of this "imputed righteousness," but here it comes into the argument, as it were, obliquely, and we are told, that "since without holiness no one can see the Lord, and we have no holiness of our own, so we must have the righteousness of the Lord imputed unto us, that *his* righteousness may cover *us* as with a wedding garment." In all this there is a great fallacy lurking imperceptibly. If the righteousness of Christ be *merely* imputed, and not actually transferred to us, it follows that we are made fit for God's presence by a forensic fiction: and this is a conclusion to which, however reluctantly, the Wesleyan (and the Churchman who holds this dogma) must eventually come; that is, if we thus fairly argue out the matter. But let it even be granted, that this does not make a *reductio ad absurdum*, and that we *are* thus, by a forensic

fiction, accounted righteous, there remains the evil of our own hearts working in us, and striving against the Spirit; so that while we may be unable, like St. Paul, to *do* that which is good, we are nevertheless clothed all over in the righteousness of Christ. If, on the other hand, it be said, that the sanctifying influence of the Spirit is always given to those who by faith seek it, we reply, that this is not an *imputed* but an *implanted* righteousness—frail indeed, and imperfect, but given according to the measure of the creature's capacity. We might go on more at length to expose this error, which we really hold to have a most mischievous tendency, but our limits forbid, and we pass to the doctrine of Predestination. Wesley pronounced himself an Arminian, and called his magazine "*The Arminian Magazine;*" but this seems to have been rather to denote opposition to Calvinism, which he rightly felt to be a doctrine dishonourable to God and pernicious to man. But when the works of Wesley are compared with those of Arminius, it will be found that for clearness, consistency, and spirituality, the former are infinitely preferable. Wesley boldly and decidedly rejected the doctrine of an *individual* election to eternal life, and declared, over and over again, that the election spoken of in Scripture is an election of *characters*. "He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved, and *he that believeth not* shall be damned:" thereby he at once cut the gordian knot which Baxter in vain endeavoured to untie, and cleared himself from any entanglements on the score of injudicious admissions. That in this he did well we cannot doubt. It may be, nay, we think it very probable, that he was unacquainted with the mode in which metaphysical divines have handled the subject of Predestination; and we are induced to form this opinion from various passages in his own writings: but if he were, he did wisely not to publish to his societies *their* solution of the difficulty; for splendid and sublime and triumphantly satisfactory as it is, it requires a mind of the highest order to comprehend it—is confusion worse confounded if it be not fully understood—and, moreover, is not necessary to salvation.

A few words on Christian Perfection shall close our remarks on Wesleyan doctrine. The opinions of Wesley himself on this topic seem to have been rather indefinite, though the tendency of them appears to be, that absolute perfection, even in this world, is attainable, though rarely attained. Some of his followers deny this, and attempt to clear his memory from what they regard as a false accusation; others, again, contend that the doctrine is a scriptural one. Dr. Adam Clarke maintains it in all its fulness, in his note on Matt. v. 48. This doc-

trine is held, we believe, by none within the pale of the Church; and we shall, therefore, very briefly state what we understand by Christian perfection. It is a perpetual advance in the divine life, from however small a beginning. Thus we call the acorn perfect, if it possess that principle of vitality which will one day make it shoot up into the oak; we call the chrysalis perfect, if it be capable of becoming a butterfly: but if *this* be taken away, there is an end of the perfection. Now with regard to *Christian* perfection, we are commanded to be "perfect, even as our Father which is in heaven is perfect;" but we cannot, by reason of our frail and finite nature, attain to the divine perfection, and yet no other model could possibly be put before us; for however holy any man may have been, it is yet possible for another man to be more holy: the human perfection, therefore, of Christ is set before us as our model—a perfection human yet divine, and the only model which is at all times applicable to our situation, and must at all times be beyond our experience. And if we do sincerely, however imperfectly, strive to imitate this model—if, leaving the things that are behind, we press forwards to those that are before, doubtless we shall, in an unending career of progressive perfection, understand how literally the words may be taken, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." When the man of God has become perfect through suffering, when he has escaped from sorrow and mutability, and has with a devout though feeble perseverance imitated the example of the *incarnate God*, then, in the second stage of his existence, are the perfections of the *glorified Redeemer* set before him; and unattainable and all inconceivable as they are, does he go forward in the pursuit of them, with a purpose no longer wavering, with a step no longer impeded, with a clear sight and an undying love—on—on—for ever. This do we believe to be the doctrine of Christian perfection, and we cannot flatter ourselves that such was the doctrine as taught by John Wesley.

Thus have we examined the present state, the origin, the ritual, and the creed of Methodism; and judging, as we think every fair reasoner, every right-minded man must judge, that, schismatical as they are, they are nevertheless a respectable and important body, it will be not without interest to ascertain what position they choose to occupy with regard to the Church. They have separated; they are not of us; and though they will not be called Dissenters, inasmuch as they agree with us in doctrines (at least, they do so almost entirely, and think they do so wholly), it will yet be difficult to assign them any other name. And here we find a very remarkable fact—a fact no less than this: that a body, openly though not *avowedly*

schismatic, have yet commenced their schism without malice, perfected it without bitterness, and still perpetuate it without hatred. This is, we may venture, without any fear of contradiction, to say, the most remarkable event in the whole compass of ecclesiastical history.

It is quite true, that many writers deny the fact altogether, and maintain that the Methodists are *really*, though not *apparently*, as hostile to the Church as any other sect of separatists; but we will try them by their own documents, and if we find that their practice corresponds with their professions, we shall support our proposition, and contend, that extraordinary as is their position as we view it, we have yet viewed it in the true light. First, then, as to their *declarations*—and here we of course commence with Wesley, and *him* not speaking simply as an individual, but expressing in conference the deliberate opinions of the body:—

"We are not Dissenters, in the only sense which our law acknowledges; namely, persons who believe it is sinful to attend the service of the Church. We are not Seceders; nor do we bear any resemblance to them. We set out upon quite opposite principles. The Seceders laid the very foundation of their work in judging and condemning *others*. We laid the foundation of our work in judging and condemning *ourselves*. They begin everywhere with showing their hearers how fallen the Church and ministers are. We begin everywhere with showing our hearers how fallen they are *themselves*."—*Minutes of Conference*, vol. i., p. 57.

We have no hesitation in saying, that Wesley's definition of "Dissenters" is neither correct, nor even plausible: but the declaration shows, as plainly as words can do it, his regard for the Church, of which he was a minister, and his unwillingness to be implicated in the charge of separation. Again, he had no superstitious objection to the ceremonies of the Church, and rightly condemns those of the Reformers who devoted to this their chief attention:—

"What is the condition of the Reformed Churches? It is certain that they were reformed in their opinions, as well as their modes of worship. But is not this all? Were either their tempers or lives reformed? Not at all. Indeed, many of the Reformers themselves complained that 'the Reformation was not carried far enough.' But what did they mean? Why, that they did not sufficiently reform the *rites* and *ceremonies* of the Church. Ye fools and blind! to fix your whole attention on the circumstantials of religion! Your complaint ought to have been, the essentials of religion were not carried far enough. You ought vehemently to have insisted on an entire change in men's tempers and lives; on their showing that they had 'the mind that was in Christ,' by 'walking as he also walked.' Without this, how exquisitely trifling was the reformation of opinions and rites and ceremonies."

This is an enlarged and reasonable Christianity, and in the same spirit have the chief ministers of the connexion continued even to the present day. Nor did the founder of Methodism object to what Dissenters impudently and impiously call a "State Church." But the testimony of Wesley upon this subject is rendered, if possible, doubly strong by the mode in which it has been lately repeated in conference. In the year 1834, Mr. Jackson (the author of "The Centenary") delivered a speech in conference, which he was afterwards requested to publish. The speech was delivered under very peculiar circumstances, which we shall have shortly to notice; and we shall make considerable use of the document, as it is in a more than usual manner *official.* Mr. Jackson, too, is the editor of the "Wesleyan Methodist Magazine," and alludes to his editorial duties, in the introduction to his published remarks, thus—

"The writer of the following pamphlet, having had the honour for several years to sustain an office of considerable responsibility in the Wesleyan connexion, felt it his duty, at the late conference of ministers belonging to that body, to state his views concerning the position in which they stand in regard to the Established Church, and which he conceives they are bound ever to maintain. His brethren were pleased to express their approbation of his remarks, and to request him to publish them, in any form he might choose; and it is in compliance with this request that he commits these sheets to the press."

A pamphlet thus published may then fairly be taken as an exposition of the society's views, so far as they wish those views to be publicly known. We shall, by and bye, prove their sincerity. Alluding to the charge of "heathenism" brought against a Church connected with the State, Mr. Jackson quotes Mr. Wesley, and enlarges with much judgment on the decision of the "venerable founder:" he remarks—

"A Church may be entirely separated from the State, and yet remain for ages thoroughly corrupted by 'heathenism,' in the sense described by Mr. Wesley; and a Church may be united to the State, and yet continue as pure from all such injurious admixture, as were the churches planted by the apostles. The Roman Catholic Church in Ireland has been separated from the State ever since the time of the Reformation, and has by the State been often oppressed and persecuted; and yet it contains all the 'heathenism' which Mr. Wesley so forcibly describes: and the same may be said of the Greek Church, as it existed for several centuries under the Turkish yoke. On the other hand, the Church of Scotland is united with the State, as an Establishment; but it is perfectly free from all approaches to the 'heathenism' in question. Neither upon the clergy nor the laity does the State confer any 'wealth' or 'honour.' The Church is said to be scarcely able to keep even her collegiate buildings in repair; and certainly her forms of public wor-

ship are as free from pomp, and as bare of ceremony, as the most determined puritan can desire. And yet it is undeniable that Mr. Wesley, with all his love of simplicity, preferred the Church of England, with its prelates and liturgy, to that of Presbyterian Scotland. In one of his visits to Edinburgh, he says—

"'I attended the Church of England service in the morning, and that of the Kirk in the afternoon. Truly "no man having drunk old wine, straightway desireth new." How dull and dry did the latter appear to me, who had been accustomed to the former!'—*Works*, vol. iii., p. 463.

"And in a letter addressed to Sir Harry Trelawney, he says—

"'You have need to be thankful that your prejudices against the Church of England are removing. Having had an opportunity of seeing several of the Churches abroad, and having deeply considered the several sorts of Dissenters at home, I am fully convinced that our own Church, with all her blemishes, is nearer the scriptural plan than any other in Europe.'"—*Ibid*, vol. xii., p. 121.

Here, then, we have not merely the opinions of Wesley on the subject of establishments, and what is more, on the subject of *ceremonies*, but those opinions re-echoed and commented upon by the editor of the "Methodist Magazine," and published, at the request of conference, in the year 1834. After this we shall be prepared to hear that—

"The Wesleyan Methodists have never been disposed generally to complain of the 'grievances' of which the nation has heard so much within the last twelve months; and, indeed, some of those 'grievances' obviously involve the question of a religious establishment, which, as we have seen, no consistent Wesleyan can condemn, either as unlawful or inexpedient."

Nor shall we see anything inconsistent in the late Mr. Watson's statement:—

"The prevalent sentiment of the Methodists, as a body, towards the Establishment, has been that of friendship. It was so when the Church was in a lower religious state than it is at present; and its more recent religious improvement has not diminished the feeling. We rejoice that she has great influence with the mass of the population, whenever that influence is used for the promotion of true religion and good morals. We wish her prosperity and perpetuity, as we wish all other Christian Churches; and the more so, as we recognize in her 'the mother of us all,' and can never contemplate without the deepest admiration her noble army of confessors and martyrs, and the illustrious train of her divines, whose writings have been, and continue to be, the light of Christendom."—*Life of Wesley*, p. 361.

We have now, before we proceed to show the causes and the nature of the Wesleyan schism, to exhibit the sentiments of Mr. Wesley on separation:—

"Thus, for instance, in a sermon preached on laying the foundation

of the City-road Chapel (April 21, 1777), Mr. Wesley observes, 'It cannot be denied that there have been several revivals of religion in England since the Reformation. But the generality of the English nation were little profited thereby; because they that were the subjects of those revivals, preachers as well as people, soon separated from the Established Church, and formed themselves into a distinct sect. So did the Presbyterians first, afterwards the Independents, the Anabaptists, and the Quakers. And after this was done, they did scarce any good, except to their own little body. As they chose to separate from the Church, so the people remaining therein separated from them, and generally contracted a prejudice against them. But these were immensely the greatest number; so that, by that unhappy separation, the hope of a general national reformation was totally cut off.'"

Here is sound philosophy as well as Christian feeling: yet the man who thus preached had already virtually separated. We quote from Mr. Hodgson's pamphlet what may be considered as a very fair sequel to that from Mr. Wesley's published sermon: the one shows his opinion of the tendency of schism; what we are about to lay before our readers will exhibit his desire that his followers should avoid it—avoid it, if necessary, even to the renouncing of Methodism itself:—

"To this (says he) may be added a quotation from a pamphlet published shortly after the death of Mr. Wesley, 'by a member of the Established Church,' and entitled, 'Considerations on a Separation of the Methodists from the Established Church.' The reader may attach what credit he pleases to the statement, but as it contains nothing inconsistent with the openly avowed and published sentiments of Mr. Wesley, and the writer confirms it by his 'solemn asseveration,' we are inclined to accept it as authentic. In reference to the preceding quotation from the 'Arminian Magazine,' the writer observes, 'But let it not be thought that Mr. Wesley then spoke what he did not think *before*. No; these last solemn words were the result of long consideration and uniform conviction. I solemnly aver, that in the year 1777, or 1778, I asked him the question—'Sir, in case the Methodists should, after your death, leave the Church of England, what would you advise your friends to do?' He answered immediately, '*I would advise them to adhere to the Church, and quit* THE METHODISTS; but (added he) that will never be necessary; for, if some quit the Church, others will adhere to it, and then there will be *Dissenting Methodists* and *Church Methodists*.'"

This last remark is exactly the opinion maintained by Daniel Isaac, in his "Ecclesiastical Claims Investigated;" for he says that though a Methodist, and a Methodist preacher, he is yet a Dissenter "upon principle;" and he then forthwith proceeds to belabour the Church and her ministrations with a great deal of wit, but very little either of logic or piety. But we now ask Mr. Jackson, or Dr. Bunting, whether, if this be true, the blame

of schism does not rest upon *Mr. Wesley* himself, as well as those who are called after him? He foresaw then that if some would adhere to the Church others would quit her, and so *there would be Church Methodists and Dissenting Methodists.*

Now all this arises from a confusion in Mr. Wesley's own mind; for we agree with Mr. Jackson that it is very unfair to praise the churchmanship of Wesley, and condemn his followers for schism, as though they had deviated from his rules. We know perfectly well that Dr. Bunting and Mr. Jackson are, to the full, as good Churchmen as ever was the founder of Methodism—are quite as orthodox in their belief, and quite as correct in their ideas of discipline. Mr. Jackson says:—

"In the early part of his life, Mr. Wesley thought that three distinct orders of ministers—bishops, priests (or presbyters), and deacons—were divinely appointed in the apostolic Church; that to the first of these orders exclusively belonged the right of ordaining men to the sacred office; that this mode of government is binding upon the Church of God in all ages, and under all circumstances, till the end of time; and that an uninterrupted succession of bishops, as a distinct order of men, from the apostolic period, is necessary to give validity to the Christian ministry. On these points his opinions underwent a complete change, which he had the candour publicly to avow. 'The uninterrupted succession (says he) I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove.' As early as the year 1746 he declared his belief that bishops and priests were both one order of men in the apostolic Church, possessing the same rights and exercising the same functions."

And yet with all this "*light*," as we suppose many would call it, the "*prejudices*" of Mr. Wesley's education led him practically to make a difference which few would suspect: he maintained in words that there was *no* apostolical succession, and by actions that there was; and not only this, but that he was in that succession, and also the travelling preachers after he had ordained them.

"In a sermon (on Heb. v. 4) published about two years before his death, Mr. Wesley, having established the distinction between the *priestly* and the *prophetic* offices under the old dispensation, contends that the same analogy holds good under the new, between the office of an *evangelist* or *teacher*, and that of a *pastor*, to whom peculiarly belongs the administration of the sacraments. We only mention the passage for the sake of the declaration which he appends, namely, 'that he and his brother considered the lay preachers in the light of *evangelists* or *preachers* only, when they received them as helpers in the work, or they never should have admitted them.'"

Here, then, we have the principles of schism, viz., first a denial of apostolical succession, and then the singularly inconsistent assumption of the powers which that succession implies.

Yet it was not without great hesitation that the various steps were taken which made schism complete.

"Mr. Wesley first ordained ministers for Scotland, where, as in America, he states that he 'invaded no man's right;' and it was not till the year 1790 that he claimed the full exercise of this power for England also. Thus a period of half a century had elapsed from his first employment of lay preachers to the period of his assuming the full powers of presbyterian ordination—a circumstance which, when we consider the importunity of the preachers and the sanction which this assumption would have received at a far earlier period amongst the great bulk of his followers, cannot be received as demonstrative evidence of any preconcerted plan of effecting a separation, or any extraordinary rapidity in carrying that plan into execution."

Neither did the conference exhibit more eagerness to do that which the very constitution of the society rendered unavoidable. Let us again hear Mr. Jackson, and let him give us his reasons as well as his facts:—

"1. The introduction of the sacraments into the Methodist chapels was conceded by the conference with the greatest reluctance, and after long hesitation and delay. Mr. Wesley never manifested half the reluctance, nor did he spend half the same time in deliberation, when he was compelled, through the pressure of uncontrollable circumstances, to violate the order of the Church by preaching in the open air, building chapels, forming societies, and praying extempore in public.

"2. The conference had no other means of preventing an extensive division in the connexion. The French Revolution had, at that time, introduced into the community at large a habit of speculating upon the abstract principles of government. Several persons in the Wesleyan body mixed up the question of the administration of the sacraments with proposals for subverting the constitution of the connexion, and forming it according to democratic theories. By giving the Lord's Supper to the societies that desired it, the wishes of the more pious and devout members were met, and such persons were taken out of the hands of the agitators who had ulterior objects in view. Had that ordinance been withheld, and the threatened extensive division taken place, the Established Church would have gained nothing; for the number of her communicants and adherents would not have been increased, and the ranks of strict Dissent would have been greatly strengthened.

"3. The changes introduced by the conference were, after all, only a practical exemplification of Mr. Wesley's own principles; nor could he have long resisted them had his life been spared."

Thus, then, according to this *authoritative* and *official* document, whose truthfulness we have neither the right nor the inclination to question, we find, that even in the very act which completed the schism, not only was no ill-will towards the now

forsaken Church manifested; but the fact, that no injury could, in the judgment of the separatists, accrue to her, was urged as a reason for its adoption. Once more:—

"In the year 1794, the conference—still resolved, as much as possible, to resist innovation, and tread in the steps of their venerated founder—gave the societies the following results of their deliberations on the subjects in question:—

"'Preaching in church hours shall not be permitted, except for special reasons, and where it shall not cause a division.

"'As the Lord's Supper has not been administered, except where the society has been unanimous for it, and would not have been contented without it; it is now agreed that the Lord's Supper shall not be administered in future, where the union and concord of the society can be preserved without it.

"'The preachers will not perform the office of baptism, except for the desirable ends of love and concord; though baptism, as well as the burial of the dead, was performed by many of the preachers long before the death of Mr. Wesley, and with his consent.'

"It was impossible that these concessions, guarded and limited as they were, could give general satisfaction to the societies, because they gave to individual members the power to oppress their brethren, and that in the affairs of private conscience. Suppose a society to have consisted of several hundred persons, all of whom, with the exception of one or two, were desirous of 'eating of that bread, and drinking of that cup,' at the hands of the ministers by whom they had been converted from the error of their way; yet this very inconsiderable minority might offer an effectual resistance to the claim, however conscientiously it might be preferred. Nothing could give birth to such defective legislation, but an almost unconquerable desire and determination to keep the societies in union with the Church, according to Mr. Wesley's arrangement."

Now, after this, we may differ as widely as we please—and we do differ *very* widely from the Wesleyan body; but we must admit, and we ought to admit with joy, that, schismatic as they are, they are honest, well-intentioned, and Christian-minded men: nor has their practice differed in other instances from their profession. In the year 1834, Joseph Rayner Stephens, an individual of considerable talent and address, was a travelling preacher in the connexion. Agreeing in principle with Daniel Isaac (whose name has been already mentioned, and whose works, it ought to be observed, were suppressed by the conference), this Stephens avowed himself a Dissenter, and acted as secretary to a country branch of the infamous *Ecclesiastical Knowledge Society*. Now, though the conference would hardly have interfered with his *private* opinions, they felt that his *public* conduct required their censure, and they insisted on his renouncing the

unholy and inconsistent office which he had undertaken. Stephens refused, and defended both his secretaryship and his refusal to renounce it. The consequence was, that the matter was made a subject of special deliberation, and Mr. Stephens was expelled. Here, then, are two circumstances worthy of note —first, the suppression of a book because it was written against the Church; secondly, the expulsion of a minister for a similar cause.

While we thus do justice to the body, we must not conceal that they greatly overrate their own strength, and their own importance. Not a small part of the Methodists think and say, that the Church stands by their forbearance!—that were *they* to join the ranks of the political Dissenters, the ecclesiastical fabric would totter and fall. We say this advisedly, for we are well aware that it is true. The answer to this absurd self-glorification is to be found in their own statistics. They say, and they say rightly, that they greatly outnumber all other sects; and thus we arrive at the conclusion, that there are half a million of Protestants in the United Kingdom who are not in communion with the Anglican Church. The fact is, we allow, awful, when we consider it as indicating the extent of schism, but by no means formidable in a political point of view. "King George nebber fear (says the black Barbadian dancing-master, in a well-known tale), King George nebber fear while 'Badian stand 'tiff; 'Badian born, hab only one fault—he really too brave!" But it is hardly fair to laugh at the Wesleyan Methodists for overrating their aid to the Church, since they do honestly afford it. Would that they could with equal success ward off the charge of schism, as they can that of disaffection:—

"If, therefore, (says Mr. Hodgson) we have laboured to state the principles of Mr. Wesley with fairness and candour, we entreat his followers to abide by their application. He considered even the corruption of the Church as no apology for separation; and as the Wesleyans themselves acknowledge 'its recent religious improvement,' the case is, therefore, not altered for the worse. Mr. Wesley has answered, by anticipation, all possible objections against attending the ministrations of the Establishment. In the 'Large Minutes' (a public document by which the special character and work of the preacher are defined, and which contains most of the rules whereby they consent to be governed), he earnestly requests his preachers, first, to 'exhort all the people to keep close to the Church and sacrament; secondly, to warn them all against niceness in hearing, a prevailing evil! thirdly, to warn them also against despising the prayers of the Church.' He quotes for their instruction the example of a zealous Papist (Mr. Hook), who, in apology for attending the Protestant service where there was no Romish service, observed, 'If I cannot have such worship as I would, I will have such worship as I can.'" * * *

"Wesley commenced his career (so far as it was irregular) by street and field preaching; and out of order as this conduct might appear in his character as a Churchman, yet, if it had led to no other results, the consequences would have rested with himself; and the question, at this distance of time, would have been one merely of biographical interest. But these irregularities almost necessarily led him (when we consider his methodical cast of mind) into the plan of forming distinct *societies*, whose discipline was regulated and conducted under his own immediate and exclusive supervision. We believe that Mr. Wesley's primary object, as he expresses it in his letter to Dr. Lowth, 'was not to proselyte any from one man to another, or from one congregation to another;.....but from darkness to light, from Belial to Christ, from the power of Satan to God;' and it may be charitably supposed that, in a mind so disinterested as his, the secondary means which he employed, were employed *bonâ fide* with reference to the attainment of his primary object. We may certainly concede the *sincerity* of Mr. Wesley's conduct, and yet, at the same time, contest its *propriety*."

Perhaps, had the clergy come forward when this new stimulus was applied, Methodism might have existed still as a *system*, but not as a schism; but, on the other hand, their conduct was, on the whole, openly unworthy. It would be a painful task to expose the errors and vices which prevailed among them; and we may be quite sure that when attachment to the Church was fast becoming a mere tradition, the purity and sincerity of such men as Wesley and his associates would far outweigh, in public estimation, the awfully profaned apostolical commission of the parochial clergy. But, as Mr. Hodgson very rightly remarks—

"It is necessary to admit another important element into our estimate, in order to form a correct judgment of the degree of culpability which attaches to Mr. Wesley, and, subsequently, to the Wesleyan conference, in effecting those various aggressions on the rights and order of the Church which have been now detailed. Was the treatment which he received at the hands of the clergy and members of the national Church such as was calculated to win him from one of his clerical 'irregularities,' and fix him in that subordinate sphere which was his proper province as a true son of the Church, and in conformity with the requirements of canonical obedience? Or was the treatment which his followers received from the same parties such as was calculated to win them from the 'error of their ways,' and attach them to the communion of that Church, not as 'irregular auxiliaries,' but as forming the main phalanx of her strength? Was the treatment mild, persuasive, conciliatory? Did it evince any of that courtesy which is especially due to those who, we have reason to believe, are not wilfully in error?"

Alas! Mr. Hodgson's question must have an unfavourable reply. Violence, ribaldry, and the most unmitigated persecu-

tion—such were the weapons wielded against the "new sect." Not unfrequently their very lives were endangered; and if they could at any place perform their worship without an attack of the populace, they blessed God for an extraordinary mercy.

Doubtless, had the ministers of the Church, in their several stations, been wise enough to attempt, not to suppress, but to direct the new impulse, the results might have been more happy, and the efficiency of our Church restored without the loss of so many members. The desirableness of such an arrangement at this period, is admitted by one of the most eminent writers which the Wesleyan body has yet produced:—

"It would, indeed, have been more satisfactory (observes Mr. Watson), if a pious clergyman had put himself at the head of these meetings, afforded the people his counsel, and restrained any irregularities or errors which might arise; and had clergymen so qualified and disposed been found, the Church would have reaped the full benefit, and no separation, in any form, would have ensued."

This, however, was not the case; and we have, therefore, less good and more evil than if we had ourselves been actuated by a principle of Christian charity. These remarks have already advanced us far into the question, how far the Church would have been now in a better condition had Methodism never existed.

We have already made the distinction between the system and the schism of Wesley. No reasonable man can doubt for a moment, that had that eminent man organized his societies, and placed them under the direction of the parochial clergy, and had those parochial clergy *been willing* to co-operate with him—that is to say, if a love for worship and prayer and praise had been induced and kept up among the people by the joint labours of the Wesleys and the beneficed clergy—had the Methodists continued to attend the services of the Church, to receive her sacraments, to submit to her authority, and to reverence her ministers—and had those ministers checked, by loving admonitions, any tendency to irregularity in their flocks, visited, comforted, advised, and instructed them, then the Church would doubtless have been in a very different position to what she now occupies. To attempt to prove this would be folly, as none will controvert it.

Since, then, Methodism as a system, apart from Methodism as a schism, must be set aside as not a subject for argument, proceed we to discuss Methodism as a schism. It may possibly be said that the schism was necessary:—

"Mr. Whitefield (observes Dr. Adam Clarke) himself acknowledged that 'Wesley had acted wisely. The souls that were awakened under his ministry he joined in class, and thus preserved the fruits of his

labour. This I neglected, and my people are a rope of sand.' And what now remains of this great man's labours? Multitudes were converted under his ministry, and are gone to God! but there is no spiritual succession."—*Miscellaneous Works*, vol. xiii., p. 527.

We do not intend to enter into this question, for doubtless the spiritual succession here spoken of is nothing more or less than the perpetuation of schism; neither shall we enter into the other question, of how far the purity of Methodist *doctrine* was preserved by it.

"The year 1784 has been termed the 'grand climacterical year of Methodism,' not only from Mr. Wesley's assuming the power of ordination, but also from his causing to be executed the '*Deed of Declaration*,' an instrument which established a legal definition of the term 'Conference,' and which has mainly contributed to maintain the perpetuity of his system and the purity of its doctrines."—*Mr. Hodgson.*

Setting aside these topics, we must enquire whether more souls have been saved—whether the Church is now more flourishing, than would have been the case had the two Wesleys lived and died in the cloisters of Lincoln College and Christ Church. Nor need we at all, from any fear of the consequences, hesitate to answer in the negative. St. Paul rejoiced that Christ was preached, though by unauthorized persons and with an unholy intention; and had not spiritual blessings resulted from their preaching, an inspired apostle would not have testified his joy at it. Hence, then, we see that to acknowledge the benefits derived from irregular ministrations, does not commit us to the approval of the irregular ministers. St. Paul did not *approve* those who "preached Christ of contention, thinking to add affliction to his bonds," nor did the Holy Spirit approve them, though he blessed their unauthorized labours. Hence the fruits of a man's ministry afford no proof that he is called by the Spirit to the work.

We rejoice that the Gospel is preached and good done, though it be by such as "the person *Binney*," whose unhallowed tempers and want of authority are proof sufficient that neither the Spirit of God, nor the successors of the apostles, called him to the ministry. Much more, then, do we rejoice when the same Gospel is preached in love and sincerity, and soundness of doctrine, as is the case with the Wesleyan Methodist ministers. We do not suppose their schism is right or their orders valid, *because* they have been made, in God's hand, the instruments of much good. Let us hear the opinion of that sound EVANGELICAL HIGH CHURCHMAN, Bishop Jebb, on this subject:—

"With all its alloy, I conceive there is much pure gold in Metho-

ism. I soberly believe that it has been the providential means of reviving and diffusing, far beyond its own sphere, that inward, spiritual religion which is diffused through our liturgy, but which had been, before John Wesley's rise, almost entirely banished from our pulpits by the cold, rationalizing, spiritless system of morals *which came in fashion about the Restoration*, and reached its acme about the middle of the last century. The higher tone of morals, and the more exalted feeling of Christianity as a spiritual system, which is now, I think, rapidly gaining ground amongst the philosophic divines of our Establishment, I cannot but attribute to the indirect operation of Methodism.

"It has to my certain knowledge been productive of much advantage among the lower orders; not only increasing their piety, but, in very many instances, opening their understanding, and civilizing their manners.

"Certain it is that this system has been permitted to spread widely, and operate powerfully, and, in most instances, advantageously.

"Valuable as his (Mr. Wesley's) life and labours have been in their influence upon his own immediate followers, and especially among the lower classes of society, I am far from thinking those results either the most important or the most perfect consequences of Wesleyan Methodism. At the very commencement, he and his brother thought that the chief providential purpose of the association which they formed within the Church, was to excite, in the Church itself, a spirit of emulation. That purpose has already been substantially obtained; and I am convinced that multitudes, both in and out of holy orders, who know little more than the name of Wesley and of Methodism, have indirectly imbibed the best principles of his writings. Methodism, in a word, has been a powerful resuscitation."

With this we cordially agree, and we think that the *species* of opposition which Methodism met with, not only at its commencement, but even so late as the year 1788, was, of all lines of conduct that could have been chosen, the most detrimental to the interests of the Anglican Church. Mr. Hodgson gives us a most remarkable instance in the following passage:—

"In the year 1788, Mr. Wesley, about three years before his death, found his societies in the following dilemma. Hitherto the greater number of the preachers and chapels had been licensed under the 'Toleration Act,' not because the Methodists were Dissenters (for whose case the Act had been provided), but in order to protect themselves against the violence of lawless men, and especially to avoid the penalties of the 'Conventicle Act,' which, though purporting only to prevent seditious meetings, might be construed as affecting all religious assemblies, except in the churches of the Establishment. Ingenious men, however, found out, that as the Methodists professed to be of the Church of England, the 'Toleration Act' could not extend to them; and, though they had been undisturbed on this point for nearly fifty years, their application for licenses was now treated in a summary manner: 'You shall have no license, unless you declare yourselves

Dissenters.' Some, who considered that holding meetings for prayer or preaching, without the authority of the diocesan, was a species of dissent, acceded to the condition. But this was not sufficient; and the applicants were met by a more stringent requirement: 'You must not only profess yourselves Dissenters; you must declare that you scruple to attend the service or sacraments of the Church, or we can grant you no relief; for the Act in question was made only for those who have those scruples.'

"The ingenuity of these men had now reached its acme; the informers took the hint, and wherever the Wesleyans held a meeting for preaching or praying, the fines imposed by the 'Conventicle Act' were duly levied upon them. In vain was it that the offenders appealed to the quarter sessions for relief. The justices declared that 'the Methodists could have no relief from the "Act of Toleration," because they went to Church; and that, so long as they did so, the "Conventicle Act" should be executed upon them.' This accordingly was acted upon; and Mr. Wesley, in stating to a member of Parliament, whom he requests 'to speak a word to Mr. Pitt on that head,' observes, 'Last Sunday, when one of our ministers was beginning to speak to a quiet congregation, a neighbouring justice sent a constable to seize him, though he was licensed; and would not release him till he had paid twenty pounds, telling him "his license was good for nothing, *because he was a Churchman.*" Now, sir, what can the Methodists do? They are liable to be ruined by the "Conventicle Act," and they have no relief from the "Act of Toleration!"'

"It may be stated, in defence, that the law, in not providing for the case of the Methodists, never contemplated such a singular phenomenon as that of an organized religious community holding meetings in other places than the churches of the Establishment, and yet refusing to declare their dissent from the principles of that Establishment."

The truth is, that the body is in what the French call "a false position."

But if the Wesleyans in England are in a false position, much more are they so in America, for there they have most unwisely changed the form of their government from Presbyterianism to Episcopacy, without considering that though men may doubt whether a presbyter may not ordain another presbyter, yet no one has ever contended that a presbyter could *consecrate* a *Bishop.*

Those who contend for the *necessity* of episcopal church government, contend also, at the same time, whether they know it or not, for the apostolical succession, as a succession of *persons;* nor would they allow any number of priests to consecrate a bishop, more than any number of laymen to ordain a priest: those who merely consider episcopacy as *expedient,* would still either have *episcopal* consecration for their bishops or let the matter alone entirely. But so long as Wesleyanism remains in the

state in which it is among us, the validity of Methodist orders is to be proved or disproved by the very same arguments applied to orders among Presbyterians. In short, the Wesleyan Methodists are the *only* orthodox English Presbyterians.

We will examine this position, and show that it is capable of easy proof. John Wesley, Charles Wesley, Whitefield, Coke, and some others among the early Methodists, were ordained priests. Now if priests have the power of ordination, then these men had it, and consequently all whom they ordained were scripturally ordained. If it be said that they were not invariably set apart with prayer and the imposition of hands, we reply that we desire to raise no quibble—the *form* of ordination is nowhere so expressly commanded in Scripture as to tie the Church to any particular ritual. If the *authority* be competent, we will not quarrel with the form. Indeed, we *must* not quarrel with it; for if the imposition of hands be *essential* to ordination—so essential that there can be no ordination without it—then we at once grant the validity of Presbyterian orders, and prove that Episcopal ordination is *not* necessary even in the Anglican Church. This may seem, at first, a strange consequence to draw, but we shall soon prove that it is a correct one. It is well known that in the reign of Elizabeth many persons were, by the English bishops, licensed to the cure of souls, who had never received Episcopal ordination, but had been ordained "according to the laudable custom of foreign churches:" such were the terms in which they were spoken of by the prelates of that day. Now it is evident that though all things, all rites and ceremonies, must bend to necessity, yet these very bishops never allowed the validity of Presbyterian orders where Episcopal ordination was to be had. At the same time, every feeling both of policy and Christianity urged them to support with their sympathy the suffering churches abroad. No one *unchurched* them, for Episcopacy was *unattainable* among them, and the British prelates could not therefore doubt the propriety of a Presbyterian ministry being adopted: to have re-ordained the men whom they had set apart, would have been publicly to invalidate their ecclesiastical proceedings, to declare that they had neither ministers nor sacraments. With a truly beautiful delicacy the English bishops shrunk from this discourtesy, and simply *licensed* the parties in question. But then *they did*, and *we must*, remember that it is not the *touch* of the *bishop's fingers*, but the *commission by the bishop's authority*, that makes the presbyter. The parties licensed, as we have stated, were doubtless as truly and completely *ordained* by the bishops who licensed them as though all the usual service had been gone through in the choirs of the respective cathedrals. "The Church

(say her Articles) hath power to decree rites and ceremonies;" and this is unquestionably one which she *has* power to decree. If, then, the *authority* for ordination be complete, we have no right to cavil about the form; and if presbyters have the right to ordain other presbyters, both the Church of Scotland and the connexion of the Wesleyans are in the apostolical succession. Into this question, viz., the validity of Presbyterian orders, we shall not enter; but since we leave the matter thus undecided, it will be said—how then do we assume a right to call the Methodists schismatics? We reply that there is no impossibility in a schismatic being in the apostolical succession. The non-jurors, Hickes and Collier, who were consecrated by the deprived bishops in the reign of William III., were undoubtedly in the apostolical succession, and as undoubtedly schismatic. Let it be supposed that the bishop of any see in England had the will and the power to separate his diocese from the rest of the Anglican Church Catholic—to renounce his ecclesiastical allegiance to the Sovereign and the Metropolitan—he would not therefore lose his title to the apostolical commission; and if under these circumstances he were able to preserve his see, his ordinations would not be less valid on account of his conspicuous schism. But we have a case in hand which the Wesleyan body will immediately appreciate. They applied very liberally the term schismatic to Dr. Warren, when he thought fit, upon some real or fancied grievance, to separate from them, and to form a sect of his own: yet what apostolic claim he had among the Methodists, he had also when he became the ecclesiastical head of the *Warrenites*. The worthy Doctor was, however, but scantily satisfied with his apostolicity, and after a silence of three years he sought and obtained ordination at the hands of the Bishop of Chester—(*en passant*, we may remark that he is becoming rapidly and extensively useful at Manchester, where he has a church).

It is a very remarkable thing, that a church may be scriptural in her doctrines, apostolic in her *internal* discipline, and her ministers may be in the apostolic succession, and yet that church may be schismatic; while, at the same time, a church, more corrupt in doctrine, and more relaxed in discipline, may be an integral part of the Church Catholic. We do not in *any* case defend schism, because we think with Thorndike (see "Tracts of the Anglican Fathers," part i. vol. ii.), that the unity of the Church is so important, that great sacrifices should be made to preserve it; but, at the same time, we must both write cautiously and speak tenderly of those against whom we have no *other* charge.

The Church of Scotland can hardly be called schismatic, though we do not consider all her doctrine scriptural, nor much

of her discipline apostolic. A violent convulsion threw the revenues of the Romanists partly into the hands of the Government and partly into those of the Presbyterians; and that which had been an Episcopal was remodelled into a Presbyterian Establishment. It can hardly be said that an Episcopal *Protestant* Church was ever *established* in Scotland; and however much we may dislike Presbyterianism, or differ from Calvinism, it will be scarcely possible for us to pronounce the Kirk schismatic.

This advantage does not belong to the Wesleyan Methodists; their constitution was formed by the side, as it were, of a Protestant Episcopal Church, whose doctrines were so pure, that no alterations were made in them for the new body; whose liturgy was so scriptural, that it was adopted at once; and whose discipline only required revival, to render it a Church altogether effective.

It is now generally acknowledged, that it was no unhallowed ambition of founding a sect that moved John Wesley to undertake his gigantic labours: he did not—possibly, could not—foresee the schism of his future disciples; his aim was but to inculcate pure religion: and we think there is but little doubt that he long thought it possible, and even probable, for the system of which he was the founder to be acknowledged by, and incorporated with, the Church.

Perhaps it would be difficult to give a stronger proof of this dutiful feeling than he did by his *never* applying the term *Church* to the Methodist body. Even when in a state of transition from semi-schism to actual schism, he constantly denominated them "his societies;" and had they been called a Church in his day, he would, doubtless, have set the parties using the term right in their ecclesiastical notions. Yet we now hear of "the Methodist Church"—"the Wesleyan Church"—"the two Churches," that is, the Church of England and the Church of the Methodists. Instances will be found, *passim*, in the "Records of Wesleyan Life."

The question of an union between the Church and the Methodists has been more than once mooted; and Mr. Watson, in his "Life of Wesley," says, in allusion to such attempts, "the time is now past in which such an union could have been successfully contemplated." He considers also that Southey evinced "but little knowledge of his subject," when he spoke of it as a thing both feasible and desirable. Yet even in these present days the idea still prevails in the minds of many Churchmen; and Mr. Hodgson's pamphlet advocates the consecration of Dr. Bunting as a Wesleyan bishop. This is certainly the most rational plan ever yet proposed, and we shall, therefore,

devote a page or two to show that the projected union is not sufficiently within the bounds of likelihood to justify us in entertaining any hopes on the subject. We observed in our last number, in an article entitled "The Church and the Novelists," that the great secret of success among Dissenters was, that their converts were made *in society*. Now what we there said of other bodies, is likewise true of the Wesleyan Methodists. Well educated as their ministers are, and still better educated as they are likely to be, since the establishment of the Theological Institution, they are yet, in point of birth, polish, station in society, expectations, and manners, certainly below the average of the clergy.

We do not take such men as Dr. Bunting and Dr. Alder, Mr. Newton and Mr. Lessey, as specimens, any more than we could take the Bishops of London, Lincoln, and Winchester, as specimens, generally, of the talents, learning, and manners of the clergy. Mr. Watson intimates that the Church does not and cannot do what Methodism is accomplishing; but we maintain, that though most assuredly she *does* not, yet she is both bound and able to evangelize the same classes. And do we blame either the Church or the clergy for her present inefficiency—an inefficiency that is daily being obviated by the bounty of the religious world? Assuredly *not*. Had the revenues, with which she was endowed by *private* liberality, been left at her disposal, and only turned from *superstitious* to pious uses, we should have had no sectarianism in the land; there would have been a sufficiency of religious instruction, and a sufficient number of religious instructors: and though we do not go so far as the Tractarians, who call the Reformation itself a sin, yet we are bound to allow that it was brought about in a very sinful manner. Spoliation and robbery are but sorry foundation-stones for a pure and apostolic establishment. Nor ought we to be surprised at the necessity for additional Curates' Societies and Church Pastoral Aid Societies, when we know that the funds which ought to provide religious instruction for the people were given to those "friends of humanity," the reforming Dukes of Bedford and others.

But in the nineteenth century this is surely right. We now want more enlightened instructors than our besotted ancestors in the days of Jewel or Hooker. "Political economy"—"the principles of representation"—"the rights of the people"—"the greatest happiness of the greatest number"—*these* are the topics upon which we want instruction now; and surely we are more likely to obtain it from the liberal and illustrious house of Russell, than from such antiquated persons as the Archbishop of Canterbury and his brethren on

the bench. But it is an insult to the respectable Wesleyans to introduce such discussion into a paper which treats of them and their system.

We would, therefore, only observe, that it is want of funds alone which disables the Church from doing all that the Methodists are now able to do. This is a subject to which we shall presently return: we have here to speak of the oft projected union between the Church and the disciples of Wesley. And, at first sight, it would seem as though there need be no great difficulty: there is no heresy to recant, there is no bitterness to cast aside, no hatred, malice, or uncharitableness; it is but an union in discipline, where there is already a coincidence in doctrine. Suppose, then, that the body of the Wesleyans were willing to admit Dr. Bunting as their consecrated head—and he is a man whose learning, courtesy, and piety would make him very acceptable to all parties;—let it be granted that they were willing to confess, that both Wesley and themselves were egregiously in the wrong in permitting a Presbyterian ministry (which, by the way, they would necessarily be very slow to do); there would then be many practical difficulties which the conference would be quick to foresee, and which we do not think could easily be obviated. For if Methodism were made *subsidiary* to the Church, then the Wesleyan ministers would be placed in an inferior position to the clergy of the Establishment, and that by means of a constant series of contrasts; nor would there be any help for this, as it would be manifestly unjust to the graduate of Cambridge or Oxford, to allow the itinerant preacher the same title to benefices as himself. Thus, then, there would be no more done than to consecrate the Wesleyan places of worship, and to license Dr. Bunting to ordain their ministers. The Episcopal clergy of Scotland and America are permitted, by leave of the English bishops, to do occasional duty in England, but not to hold benefices or to serve cures. Surely more would not be done for the Wesleyans. Now this, as, in the first place, it would not please *them;* so, in the second place, it would not *serve the Church.* It would only make a difference in name from their present position; and the difference would perpetually remind them that there was a privileged order of men higher in the Church than themselves, ministering to higher classes in society, and eligible for more elevated as well as more lucrative posts. If it be said that the difference would give them valid ordination, we must remember that they consider their present ordination valid: and if the Presbyterian clergy of Scotland be validly ordained, so are the itinerant preachers among the Wesleyan

Methodists. When Bishop Heber proposed to ordain the Wesleyan missionaries in Ceylon, they replied, "My lord, we are ordained already." This is sufficient to show that the mere offer of Episcopal ordination would have but little weight with them.

At present, very little intercourse takes place between the clergy and the Methodist preachers; and perhaps, so little as they seem generally to understand one another, it is well that it should be so. But were the Methodist system made subsidiary to the Church, a constant intercourse would necessarily commence; and then we would not give much for *their* knowledge of human nature who could not foresee disastrous results: the one would assume a tone of superior dignity, and the other a tone of superior sanctity; each would complain that the other encroached upon his province; the one would suffer no equal, the other no superior: and the consequence would be, the probable annihilation of Methodism, and very great damage to the Church. Nor let it be said that we are drawing too dark a picture. We believe that, taken as a body, the clergy are both pious and conciliating. We can say no less of the Wesleyan preachers. Yet we do not believe that either are so perfect as to be safely placed in circumstances of so strong temptation as these would be. At present, the independent position of the Methodist preachers subjects them to no rule but that of their own conference. In the supposed position, they would be liable to perpetual interference on the part of the Church dignitaries. We do not mean, in this parallel, to state what we conceive would be really the best plan for the Wesleyans to pursue, for we think Episcopal ordination would be cheaply purchased at any rate; nor do we hold *any* other ordination scriptural or valid, where that may be had. We are not, therefore, adducing arguments why the Wesleyans *should* not, but reasons why we conceive they *would* not, adopt, on such a basis, an union with the Establishment. They would, in a temporal point of view, gain nothing by the step; ecclesiastically, they would only gain what they are well contented without, while they would lose their independence, their historical consistency, and much detract from their social position.

But while we view in this light this often proposed union, we must not lose sight of the leading idea which characterizes it: it is that the middling orders of society are but imperfectly cared for by the Church. We have already once referred to "The Church and the Novelists;" and because we are not desirous to repeat the arguments we there adduced, we shall merely request the reader to bear in mind the picture we drew

of the class of shopkeepers. These are the orders out of whom Dissenters are made—these are the potentates at vestry meetings and political associations—these are the effectual opponents of Church rates and Church purposes—these are the readers of Whig-Radical newspapers, at once the dupes and the patrons of demagogues. And why? Is it that they are worse disposed than other Englishmen? Is it that they are grossly ignorant, or atrociously malicious? Not at all. They are not, indeed, men of high education; but they are, for the most part, well informed, though they know nothing of political economy, in which they fancy themselves so eminently skilled; they are, for the most part, well intentioned, though they do, by their injudicious use of the still more injudiciously granted franchise, incalculable mischief to the community; and they are, for the most part, honest, though they continually strive to avoid the payment of an equitable assessment. The reason of this paradox is, that the Church has no hold upon the tradesman, save by an occasional drain upon his pocket. He may, if he pleases, go and hear the rector or the curate; but if he has no inclination that way, neither the rector nor the curate will ever ask him *why* he does not. Were he a labouring man, and sick, they would come and pray with him, and relieve him, and talk with him, and instruct him. Were he a professional man, or a "squire," and invited them, they would come and dine with him, and induce him, if possible, to attend the house of God, and interest him, by reason of private friendship, so to do. As it is, they cannot presume to do the first, lest he should be offended at their unasked advice; *he* cannot do the second, lest they should be disgusted at his presumption. There is a great deal of false shame in both; but this false shame is one of the most remarkable ingredients in the English character, ever has been so, and, according to all probability, ever will be so. We are a self-esteeming nation, and rarely commit ourselves to circumstances where our self-esteem may be wounded. In the present instance there is also another obstacle to free intercourse. The chief maxim inculcated in an Oxford education is, that "a man should never commit himself;" and as nearly one half of the clergy are Oxonians, there is little probability that the evil of which we complain will be speedily rectified. Now these classes are reached, and reached effectually, by the Dissenting and Wesleyan teachers: they can, without loss of dignity, dine with the grocer and take tea with the haberdasher, and, after the evening service, walk home with the tailor's family to supper: and thus their influence is extended, and a great idea of their pastoral care is induced;

while the same parties think only of the clergyman as a man whom they pay, but who is too proud to associate with them. Few of them are aware how great is the fallacy to suppose that they pay the clergyman at all; fewer still are aware that his familiar society would be so irksome to them, and theirs to him, that they would soon be on less agreeable terms than at present: and for want of knowing these facts, the clergy, if not absolutely disliked, are certainly not popular among the class of shopkeepers. But, moreover, in the present state of our parochial system, if the clergy were ever so well disposed to be on familiar terms with *all* their parishioners, it would still be a physical impossibility; they cannot attend to all the poor who need their help and their instruction—they cannot attend to the calls of the higher classes, who desire the advantage of their society: and hence, knowing that the shopkeepers and their order have the means of obtaining instruction, they leave them to their own devices.

Now, though this has been the case, it has ever been freely acknowledged that it was incumbent on the Church to dispense, with an equal hand, her blessings to all her children: and this proposed union of the Church and the Wesleyans may, at all events, though impracticable *in itself*, afford us a clue to a more feasible arrangement. The leading idea is, as we have seen, to establish a middle order between the present clergy and the lower portion of the middle class, having the social rank of the one and the business of the other—an order, indeed, somewhat analogous to the friars of the Roman Church, only without their dirt and superstition. Into this post it was proposed to put the Wesleyan ministers; and we have given ample reasons why they are never likely to accept it. But are we to go barefoot because we cannot persuade a tailor to make shoes? Is there *no* order of men who might, with advantage to themselves and the Church, do the lacking services? An attempt has been made somewhat to this effect, though with a different purpose, viz., the system of lay agency adopted by the Church Pastoral Aid Society. We need not now enlarge on the lawfulness of this plan; it might be successfully defended on the principles even of the Tractarians themselves: for, first, the lay agents were to act entirely under the direction of the parochial clergy; and secondly, their duties were to consist in what it is every Christian man's duty to do as far as he can, whether he be paid for it or not. We say, therefore, nothing more about the lawfulness of this lay agency, but shall go on to treat of its effects. It has been found that the lay agents were looked upon in the light of secondary clergy—"Shreds (as P. P. would

have it) of the linen vestment of Aaron:" they acquired "authority" among the people "in controversies of faith," and won them to church as much by their society as by their arguments. This, which was found by experience to be the case, was what we should naturally have expected; and upon this result do we ground the few following remarks. We are quite aware that, in proposing a thing new, we are proposing a thing difficult, and we therefore throw out our ideas not as a proposal, but as an hypothesis. If the order of sub-deacons were re-instituted, and the individuals were chosen not from the graduates of the Universities, but from the families of middling tradesmen, there would at once be the order required; nay, the very circumstances of the order must be made such as to ensure a *different class of men* to perform a *different class of duties.* To effect this, it would be necessary, first, to secure the means of a competent education to the proposed sub-deacon; and secondly, to secure a sufficient salary for him while in the discharge of his duties. For these purposes, recourse must be had to the nation, for the clergy are already overburdened; and, as we should soon see, it would be a profitable investment of capital. But we have stated that the very circumstances of the order must secure that the sub-deacon and the deacon shall be of different classes in society, or, at least, that they shall have different ideas of their own station at present, and different expectations for the future. It should, therefore, be expressly ruled, that the sub-diaconate should not lead to the diaconate; nay, that in the nature of the case it should be a disqualification for it. This would at once prevent those persons who deemed the priesthood within their grasp from offering themselves as sub-deacons, and it would also keep out those less worthy persons who might deem the office of which we speak a side-door to further ordination.

Again, as respectability would be necessary, we would propose that an especial and *Episcopal* ordination should be the mode of admitting to the office, and that some distinctive title should be given to those who exercised it. A share, also, in the public worship might be allotted to the sub-deacon: as, for example, he might be allowed to read the lessons, or perhaps the psalms, or even to perform the burial service—though we should doubt the expediency of this last. In all this we see no objection that can reasonably be raised, and we think that the order of sub-deacons, thus revived, would be not only more serviceable than the lay agents of the Pastoral Aid Society, but would avoid the unpopularity which attended that measure. We cannot see why the order should be incompatible with secular employments, or

at least with *some* secular employments—that, for instance, of instruction in any of its branches. We could hardly allow a sub-deacon to be a dancing-master, but he might undertake any engagement of a secular nature subject to the approbation of his diocesan. Here, too, would be a means, in the hands of the bishops, of making the funds and education provide themselves. Were the sub-diaconate united with the office of the national schoolmaster, the latter would be greatly raised in the social scale, made much more useful in his own peculiar vocation, and enabled also to increase the efficiency of the Church in the way of which we speak. We do not imagine that he would have much time to attend to the poor—but it is not for the poor that his services would be wanted: he might cultivate the private friendship of families to whose level he would be raised by his semi-clerical character, and occupy among them as high and a far more influential position than that now held by the Dissenting minister. We fully believe that, often without any, and generally with a slight addition to his salary, the national schoolmaster would gladly occupy the post we define; nor have we any doubt that he would be conspicuously useful. At the same time we are aware of the danger of innovation, even where the innovation is most plausible; and, as we before remarked, we throw out these hints rather as hypothetical than as a direct proposal.

We have been led to digress thus much from the theme of our discourse, viz., the Wesleyan Methodists: "revenons donc à nos moutons"—that is, let us return to Wesley and his flock.

We have just received from a friendly hand the minutes of the conference held, in 1840, at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, under the presidency of Robert Newton, and from this we give the following statistics of Methodism:—

Number of members in Great Britain	323,178
Number of members in Ireland	27,047
Number of members in British missionary stations	78,504
Number of members in the United States of America,	692,341
Number of members in Canada	16,354
Total	1,137,424

To these must be added travelling preachers:—

In Great Britain—regular	942	
Supernumerary and superannuated . . .	136	——1078
In Ireland—regular	100	
Missionaries	23	
Supernumerary and superannuated . . .	36	—— 159
		1,138,661

Brought forward		1,138,661
Foreign stations—regular	342	
Supernumerary and superannuated . . .	3	345
Canada—regular, supernumerary and superannuated .		127
United States—regular	3106	
Supernumerary and superannuated . . .	216	3322
Total of members and ministers throughout the world,		1,142,455

In Great Britain alone there has been, during the past year, an increase of 16,110 members; this is partly to be accounted for by the excitement produced by the celebration of the centenary, to which we have already adverted. The number of districts in England, Wales, and Scotland, is 33; of circuits, 411. In Ireland there are 11 districts and 50 circuits. Abroad are 256 missionary stations.

The amount of the income of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society in 1839 was 92,697*l.* 18s. 8d.; and on so splendid a scale are their missionary enterprises carried on, that their expenditure during the same period was 113,596*l.* 18s. 5d. There is a balance due to the treasurer of 20,871*l.* 19s. 9d., which the society are now gradually liquidating.

We shall conclude by pointing out the instances in which the false position of the body becomes visible. Mr. Jackson, in the speech we have before quoted, says:—

"But had the Wesleyan body approximated more than they have done to the principles and practice of Dissent, the complainants in question should be the last persons to condemn them on this account. There is a maxim of inspired wisdom, which is as applicable to bodies of people as to individuals: 'He that will have friends must show himself friendly.' No man was ever yet scolded into friendship, or frowned and beaten into esteem and affection. Dissenting ministers, though often widely differing from the followers of Mr. Wesley on several important points of theology and ecclesiastical government, will meet the Wesleyan Methodists on the missionary platform, as brethren, and even cultivate their personal friendship; but how rarely will a clergyman do either one or the other! With a few honourable exceptions, the clergy studiously keep aloof from all possible intercourse with persons belonging to the Wesleyan denomination, the very people whom they wish to attach to the Church. Holding, indeed, as many of them do, the divine right of Episcopacy, they cannot acknowledge as true ministers of Christ any persons, however estimable in other respects, who have not been Episcopally ordained; and it may be alleged that they decline all intercourse with such teachers, lest they should be thought to 'bid them God speed,' and in any way

to countenance an unauthorized ministry. Be it so. We utter no complaint. We are merely stating a fact. The Wesleyan Methodists have no desire whatever to interfere with the affairs of private conscience. Their founder has taught them to think and let think; and never to set up their own judgment as a rule of duty to other people. All we mean to say is, that those who treat their fellow Christians as 'heathen men and publicans' ought not to accuse those proscribed persons as wanting in respect to them and to their order."

This seems like saying, "I am not at all angry—oh no; but at the same time, however, I am not in the slightest degree annoyed." We can assure Mr. Jackson that we should think but little of the clergyman who would decline to "cultivate the *personal friendship*" of Wesleyan ministers for no better reason than that they were so; but as to the platform business, we do not for our own part see what business clergymen have on platforms at all. We are no friends to Exeter Hall and its absurd motto, ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΕΙΟΝ. We would, indeed, love "the brethren," but we would not parade the holy office of Christ's ministers before crowds not craving for the "bread of life," but merely seeking the excitement of an hour—a religious substitute for the theatre or the card-table. Then, again, as to the Dissenters, doubtless it is all true what Mr. Jackson says of them; for, in the first place, they have *no order* to compromise, and are, of course, very glad to be seen with their Methodist brethren, that they may say—"*nos poma natamus.*"

If we examine the management—that is, the internal management—of the body, we shall perceive many instances in which *Church* principles, though unacknowledged, have been at work, and led to results which, as in one instance we have already noticed, have virtually acknowledged an apostolical succession. Yet in the very enactment there has been some inconsistency, pointing out plainly to the attentive observer that it arose rather from the force of education than from its accordance with the system. We have seen how strictly is kept up the difference between the priest and the deacon, and, doubtless, this distinction was originated by the "Church feelings" of the two Wesleys. The preacher not "in full connexion" is not allowed to administer the eucharist; yet the local preacher, or even the man not permitted to enter the pulpit at any time, may read the prayers, absolution and all. The surplice is renounced, not as a relic of Popery, for that would condemn the Church; and, therefore, the only reason that can be assigned is, that the preachers felt themselves not entitled to it; Wesley certainly did not think many of them so. Yet, if the powers of the priesthood be assumed, there is surely some inconsistency in declining

the dress. The Dissenter acts consistently in renouncing it, and with contemptible inconsistency when he attires himself in it; for *he* declares thatit is a rag of Popery, and the Church herself "a hoary harlot." Often, however, does he, like the daw in borrowed plumes, strut his hour with the "rag of Popery" on his back, throw over his shoulders the hood and scarf (to which he is about as much entitled as he is to the crown and sceptre), and *preach*, forsooth, in the gown of a Master of Arts !!

It is hardly known, even to the generality of the clergy, on what ground stands the modern practice of reading in the surplice and preaching in the gown; and, as it is an admirable instance of right judgment and *high Church* principle, we shall take this opportunity of explaining it. That all church vestments had some mystical meaning will be, we think, universally acknowledged; that they were not merely made "for glory and beauty," but, like the robes of Aaron, to shadow forth the position, with regard both to God and the Church, of him who wore them. The surplice, the scarf, and the cassock, are all that are now in general use as strictly clerical; the gown, the hood, and the bands, marking simply the university degree of the wearer. In the earlier period of the Anglican Church it was undoubtedly customary that the *preacher*, as well as the *reader*, should wear the surplice and scarf, and it was but gradually that the present custom obtained—nor, indeed, is it now universal. Our friends, the Tractarians, would fain restore the older usage; they would have all the vestments of the minister remind the hearers that he who addresses them does so as the priest of the Church Catholic, as the authorized and accredited ambassador of Christ to his people, endowed with mystical powers, and especially chosen by the Spirit. At the same time—and in this latter respect they are quite right—they look upon preaching as but a secondary part of the Church service. The chief reason of our attendance at the house of God is not to hear Mr. A. or Mr. B., but to offer our own praises, to put up our own prayers, to make our own confession, to join with the Lord's flock in the *public* act of worship, and to receive the comfortable assurance that "He pardoneth and absolveth those who truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel." Very inferior, then, is the office of the preacher to that of the priest, and quite right are the Tractarians in their relative estimation of the two. In *this* they are in accordance with the Reformers of our Church; but, on the other hand, they are very inconsistent in wishing to bring back a custom which puts the two on an equality. The Church, according to her present practice, directs that the sermon shall be delivered from a different place and in a different dress; and for good reasons prayers are read in the surplice and scarf, to

intimate that he who reads, reads as an ordained priest, and pronounces the words of the Church, and not his own. He who preaches, preaches in a gown, and *ought* to do so in a hood, if he be entitled to wear one, in order to show that as he *now* speaks in his own person and on his *own* authority, so he has some personal claim to be heard with respect on the score of his learning. On the same ground the place of the ministration is altered; and whereas the priest speaks from the altar and from the reading-desk, the preacher addresses his auditory from the pulpit, to mark the difference of his position towards them. The Wesleyan Methodists have some graduates among them, but these never wear gowns in the pulpit; while Dissenters, whether literate or illiterate, invariably do so.

While on this topic, we would willingly enliven our disquisition by the narration of a certain D.D.'s mode of obtaining a diploma. When the University of St. Andrew's *sold* her honours —a proceeding which provoked Dr. Johnson to tell the heads of the college that they would get rich by degrees, and which has now been long abandoned—a certain minister, who deemed that his ministrations would be more acceptable and more useful if he possessed what the Germans call the doctor-hat, put 15*l.* in his purse and went to St. Andrew's "to purchase for himself a good degree." His man-servant accompanied him, and was present when his master was formally admitted to the long desired honour. On his return "the doctor" sent for his servant, and addressed him somewhat as follows: "Noo Saunders, ye'll aye be sure to ca' me *the doctor*, and gin onybody spiers at you aboot me, ye'll be aye sure to say the doctor's in his study, or the doctor's engaged, or the doctor will see ye in a crack." "That a' depends (was the reply) upon whether ye'll ca' me doctor too. (The reverend doctor stared). Aye, it's just so (continued the other); for when I fand that it coost sae little, I e'en got a diploma myself; sae ye'll just be good enough to say—doctor, put on some coals, or, doctor, bring the whiskey and hot water; and gin onybody spiers at ye aboot me, ye'll be aye sure to say the doctor's in the stable, or the doctor's in the pantry, or the doctor's digging potatoes, as the case may be." This tale was once a favourite with an eminent and facetious Dissenting minister; but he, in course of time, obtained from St. Andrew's the degree of M.A., and his friends never again heard of "*the doctor.*" While speaking of this fondness of Dissenters for academic titles, it is but fair to observe that there are no *quack* doctors among the Methodists: the degrees from Scotland or America, which some of them bear, have been unsolicited and unbought.

We return once more to our subject. We have spoken at

some length of the Methodist discipline, but have not entered its merits or demerits further than to point out its adaptation to the spirit of the age. Our objections are, first, to the system of itinerancy. We here put out of the case apostolicity and unity, and look upon Wesleyanism as that which does exist, and which, in all probability, will, whether we like it or not, continue to exist. Our first objection, then, is to the itinerancy of the preachers. Just as a man is beginning to feel that he is useful—to form friendships with his people—to be aware of the peculiarities which mark the spiritual condition of individual members—he is taken away from his flock, and a new pastor substituted in his place; he, too, has to remove at the end of two or three years: and thus no time is ever permitted to form those endearing ties between the minister and his people which is no small part of the charm of the Christian ministry. It has another bad effect—it makes the theology taught in the Wesleyan pulpits of a peculiarly elementary character. A Methodist preacher, amidst the varied and often harassing round of his duties, has but little time for study; he feels, too, that his term of abode in one circuit does not allow him to go beyond the mere *elements* of theology; and he is, therefore, compelled to be perpetually engaged in "laying anew the foundations." To this, too, the habit of extemporaneous preaching tends; and it is one which we would never recommend, save to those who had been long in the habit of writing. Nor are we at all satisfied that *habitual* itinerancy can have a beneficial tendency on the minds of the preachers themselves. Its natural effect would be to generate an impatience of delay—a restless desire of change; and it must necessarily make those subject to its influence, incapable of judging of the effects produced by long continued exertions among one flock. They must, to a certain extent, be inexperienced, even to the last hour of their lives.

We are well aware that it has its advantages—that it removes the preachers from the control of societies—that it diffuses an evenness of doctrine and practice among the whole Wesleyan body—and that, in fact, without it Methodism must fall to the ground. Still we conceive this last to be the most prevailing reason for its continuance—among those, that is, who hold the system itself to be scriptural.

Another point in which we think the discipline of the Methodists less beneficial than it might be made, is the *mode* in which spiritual equality is inculcated. We do not mean that an ecclesiastical radicalism prevails among them, nor do we for an instant advocate the keeping up of temporal distinctions in spiritual matters. But the way in which the Church aims to

impress on the minds of her children that they all—rich and poor, learned and illiterate, great and obscure—are alike before God, is one; and the way in which Methodism attempts it, is another. The one calls them together in one building, calls upon them to join in the same confession, to repeat the same creed, and gives them her authoritative commands as to their conduct one towards another; and in better times than the present, there were no cushioned pews, no curtains to shut out plebeian eyes from aristocratic devotions, no small rooms with fireplaces and tables, such as we have seen, where the great man may poke his fire, and read either the Bible or a novel, or attend to the service, or write his letters, or do, in fact, just as he likes and what he likes. Sound is the theory, and sound, even yet, to a considerable extent, is the practice of the Church. Methodism, on the other hand, *parades* her religious equality by class meetings, and similar ordinances, such as prayer meetings, love feasts, &c., where all classes (so far as all classes meet in Methodism) are put on a temporary equality. Mr. Wesley is, indeed, reported to have "taken away the ticket" from a certain cobbler, in his first London society, because the said cobbler went up to a baronet, who was also a member, and shaking him by the hand, addressed his as "brother." And Mr. Moore, an Irishman of good family, commenced a sermon on the text, "Blessed are the poor in spirit," by the very remarkable words, "Not the poor in pocket, my brethren, unless they be poor in spirit too." These two circumstances alone would show us, had we no other proofs, of the kind of equality which the lower classes among Methodists understand it to imply. The late Dr. Adam Clarke is reported to have said to a lady, who complained that she could get no good Methodist servants, "I dare say not, madam. I have been praying for one for these ten years; and I am sure that had there been one in the connexion, Providence would have sent her to my family." Dr. Clarke was not the only person who entertained the same idea; and, indeed, when we reflect that an opportunity is afforded to anybody—male or female, enlightened or ignorant—to talk, and what is more, to talk about themselves, as much as they think fit, it will be evident that strong temptations are laid in the way of such persons as we have been describing.

Before we close this paper—and it has already extended to a length greater than we anticipated—we must take a glance, and necessarily a brief glance, at the condition, social and intellectual, of the preachers. At the commencement of Methodism, they were chosen by Mr. Wesley on account of their knowledge

of Scripture, and powerful, though not often highly cultivated, minds. Samuel Bradburn (a man whose life, were it published, would be one of the most interesting, and even amusing of books) was remarkable for his strong mind and his unwearied labours. In wit and humour, few men excelled him; and the early annals of Methodism are brightened by the sparkling of his facetiousness. "See (said he, on one occasion, to one of the first chosen preachers), see the good that Methodism has done." "Yes (was the reply), it has done a great deal for us." Something in this displeased Bradburn, for he immediately said, pointing to a Mr. Marsden, "For us! Why, yes; you were a cobbler and I was a tinker, and it has made us gentlemen: but brother Marsden was a gentleman before." "You should not have called me a cobbler (said the preacher in question); it would have been more civil to have said, a boot and shoe maker." "Yes (added Bradburn); but I did not call myself a tin plate worker, but simply a tinker."

Such were the men whom Wesley made his first itinerant preachers. The writer of this has seen and conversed with many of them; among others, with the three of whom the above story is told; and it must be acknowledged that they were a class of men of great mental power—rough sometimes, and perhaps a little uncouth, but energetic, self-denying, indomitable. They were often, too, men of great personal strength; and there is current an anecdote of one who was much annoyed, on one occasion, by the profanity and impertinence of a gigantic butcher: for some time he bore patiently with the man's ribaldry, but at last his feelings were too much outraged, and walking up to the fellow, he took him by the collar and the waistband of his breeches, as though he had been a little child, and hung him up by the latter to one of the meat-hooks of his own shop, where he remained dangling till the exhortation was concluded. But those times have passed away, and a new race of preachers have arisen; and as we are investigating the present state of Methodism, we must devote a little attention to the education which these preachers receive, and the attainments which, on an average, they make. We have already acquitted them of quackery; their knowledge is required for use, not for display; and they have no "*college*," like Cheshunt, where caps and gowns are worn, and a ridiculous imitation of Cambridge and Oxford kept up: but, on the other hand, they have a very excellent Theological Institution, where young men intended for the ministry among them are able to obtain a good useful education. It is not to be supposed that they could offer the same learning that the Universities can, where the

most brilliant scholars of the day are the tutors and professors, and where fellowships and dignities are the meed of the most successful student; neither do they affect it. Thus much, however, may fairly be claimed for them: that their preachers as far exceed those of other sects in information as they do in Christian spirit. It is to be noticed, also, that there are no men more free from affectation, and from what is familiarly called *cant*, than the Methodist preachers. This will, doubtless, appear a strange assertion to many; but those who best know the truth of the case, will be best persuaded that our statement is correct. They are often men of wit and humour, abounding in anecdote, and enlivening religion by a rational cheerfulness; and we may with reason exclaim, both with regard to preachers and people, "Cum tales sitis, utinam nostri essetis."

The social position of the Wesleyan minister next claims our attention; and here we find exactly the system pursued which most tends to perpetuate Methodism. With regard to Wesleyanism, it is certainly the case that "not many mighty, not many noble are called;" its members are taken from the middle and lower classes, and the preachers necessarily from the same: the travelling preacher meets, from time to time, all the members of his flock—visits them as he finds it convenient; while the class leaders and local preachers keep up the regards of the people by their constant attention. Every Methodist is reached, and that frequently, by the authorities of the body; each, therefore, feels that his personal welfare is never lost sight of.

The maintenance which the itinerant ministers receive is just sufficient for respectability; their travelling expenses are paid, assistance is given in cases of sickness or accident, and a newly married preacher has always a small present from the same fund. The conference make an additional grant of eight pounds per annum for each child in a preacher's family; and it must be remembered that there are two excellent schools for the children of the preachers—one at Kingswood, near Bristol, one at Woodhouse Grove, near Leeds. There is also a proprietary school in the neighbourhood of Sheffield for the sons of Wesleyans generally; but of this it will not be necessary to speak further.

Thus, then, we have before us the present state of this remarkable and interesting body. The "centenary" celebrated in 1839 gave an impulse to their proceedings which could hardly be expected to be permanent; and it is possible that a reaction may follow this period of excitement. Whether this be the case or not, it is quite impossible to contemplate the

schism with other feelings than those of deep regret; or the kind and Christian line of conduct which, though schismatics, the Wesleyans have exhibited, without admiration. We have endeavoured impartially to make their condition and their sentiments known to the Church—and to do this without compromising, on the one hand, the principles of Churchmen, or, on the other hand, wounding the feelings of Methodists.

It is very important that their polity should be fully understood, because they form by far the larger part of British dissidents, and because they are the only body who ever separated from any church without hating the church from which they had departed. We see clearly the duty of all parties; but, alas! will it ever be performed? The Methodists should have their preachers made priests by ordination, and their meeting-houses *chapels* by consecration; and Churchmen should avoid all railing—all unkind feeling towards *individuals*—all hatred, malice, and uncharitableness—and put away all "evil speaking out of their mouth."

ART. II.—*The Ecclesiastical and Political History of the Popes of Rome during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* By LEOPOLD RANKE, Professor in the University of Berlin. Translated from the German by SARAH AUSTIN. 3 vols. London: Murray. 1840.

THE long expected and prodigally announced English translation of Professor Ranke's "History of the Popes from the beginning of the Sixteenth Century" has now, for a good part of a year, been before the public, and has attracted some criticism. We congratulate our countrymen on its appearance. It is well calculated to excite both taste and curiosity on a subject, on which those who are, or aspire to be thought, students in history have been eminently indifferent, and, of course, but partially informed. Very important misconceptions relative to it have, up to the present time—and the prospect does not appear to be clearing—been allowed to form the current kind and measure of information respecting a novel and most interesting —a mysteriously spiritual, or pretendedly spiritual power, asserting and wielding the dominion of the secular and every other power in all their peculiarity and force. The circumstances attending this phenomenon are worthy of very minute study, and are fraught with instruction of incalculable value, in reference to the highest interests of moral and accountable beings.

The Prussian Professor's history is not more calculated to excite interest than to reward it. His qualifications for producing a work of merit, in the sphere of his particular professorship, were confessedly great. Independently of his manifest learning, acumen, and application, he *was*—for years are passing on and changing everything—in the vigour of his age when engaged in the work; being now about fifty, and having occupied the Professor's chair since the year 1825. The work truly discovers a vast compass of historic information. The materials are, in a great degree, new and highly important, drawn from manuscript and very recondite sources. A lucid order is in general observable in the disposition and arrangement of the contents; and the inferences and reflections are not unfrequently profound, sagacious, and just. The substantial style, whether in the original or the translation before us—the French has had its day, and is gone to sleep—may be considered as the best specimen of that in modern or present favour. But this is very much a matter of taste. In short, the history by this distinguished and Protestant foreigner appears destined to hold an illustrious place among the multitudinous literary productions of the nineteenth century; and it would be disingenuous as well as unjust to refuse the meed to which it is so richly entitled.

It is, therefore, to us no little mortification to feel, from a careful and impartial perusal of the work, that it will be a duty, urged upon us by sacred considerations, materially to qualify our commendation. This will appear as we proceed in a particular examination of the volumes. Indeed, we think it so far expedient to anticipate our general conclusion, as, thus early, to enter a calm but decisive protest against the leading principle on whicht he whole moral estimate of the events recorded rests. We know well enough that it is stark heresy in the code of the majority of self-constituted censors, the present arbiters of intellect, to believe and maintain that there is an essential and important difference in the *quality*, and, what is most to the purpose, the *effects*, of certain systems of belief, particularly religious belief. In vulgar estimate all religions are equal—very respectable when adopted, and in the forms adopted, by governments which must have a religion for such of the governed as will not be satisfied without one, but perfectly needless for the intelligent, who do better with none. And here we are sadly afraid that the mark which we have hit is no other than the dominant and all-pervading principle, which, whether visibly or latently, animates and governs the whole of the philosophic production about to be examined. It is no contradiction, but even a part of this hypothesis, as well as a fact which we are not at all inclined to

deny, that the Professor occasionally exhibits a very decorous and satisfactory respect for the established religion of his country.

It is only fair dealing, however, under such an imputation, to allow the author to speak for himself. It is not to be expected that he will formally plead guilty; but, if we mistake not, there is a passage in the work which much staggered us when we came to it, and which appeared to furnish the key, most uniformly and effectually calculated to open all the locks which we shall have to encounter in the work before us. The passage occurs vol. ii., p. 20, where the subject is the rising exertions of the Papacy to recover the power upon which Protestantism had made such formidable inroads :—

"Hitherto Protestantism alone had filled the theatre of the world with those brilliant results which carried away the minds of men; but another spirit, which, if contemplated from the elevated region of enlarged and dispassionate thought, is perhaps equally deserving of veneration, though in direct opposition to that which had actuated the first Reformers, now entered the lists, equally skilled to engage the hearts of men on its side and to rouse them to activity."

The word "perhaps" may a little, as was evidently intended, soften the sentiment; but, with every deduction, the proposition stands forth in full deformity and fatuity, that there is no fundamental or essential difference between Protestantism and Popery —between the comparatively pure Christianity of the reformed creed and the polluted and polluting superstition of Rome. Some of the lights of our own age and country—for there is a wonderful harmony in such things—have given their powerful support to the same theory; and it has, moreover, the additional advantage of being equally favourable to the heathen persecutors, Julian among them, in their differences with the professors of Christianity in their day. The passage which we have thus brought out cannot be regarded as an accidental effusion. It is plainly the ruling spirit of the performance—the dominant, or rather key-note of the piece, though not always so distinctly intoned; for which we are much indebted to the writer, who must excuse us if we understand, and therefore do not extravagantly estimate, the value of "his elevated region of enlarged and dispassionate thought."

Will our readers allow an observation or two on *moderation?* A very excellent virtue is moderation: it would be well if it flourished in richer abundance; and a promising speculation it would be to institute a Moderation Society. But every good thing may be abused, and this has been in a high degree the fate of moderation. Like liberty, it may be exclaimed of this

virtue, "How many crimes have been perpetrated, promoted, or justified, under thy sacred and abused name!" It is not enough to hear both sides, and straightway determine that truth or right are in the middle. This mechanical and somewhat pliant process will in some plain cases prove a little unsafe. For example, in the instance of robbery, it would not be eminently wise, or philosophic, or moderate, to decide that the property stolen should be equally divided between the two parties concerned, who might pleasantly enough be represented as warm controvertists. Of course, no talented and prudent writer of the nineteenth century, looking down from his elevated region of enlarged and dispassionate thought, would hazard his popularity by taking either side; and it is well if, to set his liberality beyond the reach of suspicion, he did not patronize the robber's plea. The great ambition of modern historians is to write *philosophically*. There is certainly such a thing as true and applicable philosophy, and such a thing as false and inapplicable, or rather applicable only in subservience to the particular fact, or series of facts, which are made its ground or object; and miserable is the havoc made in one of the finest provinces of literature by the the non-observance, or ignorance, of this distinction, by incompetent or designing writers. For what with distortion and colouring of facts, what with suppression or interpolation, and what with the attempted solution of the connection of cause and effect by an insane and ricketty system of ratiocination—history, in hands so perverted, instead of being the herald of truth and valuable instruction, has become the pander to falsehood, delusion, and crime of every sort and degree.

We have likewise something preliminary to say respecting the sources from which the history of Professor Ranke is principally derived. These are *manuscripts* and *rare printed works*, both, in general, exceedingly valuable and satisfactory, but needing no common qualification. When documents of this class *coincide with* and confirm printed and published history of a respectable and approved character, they may be admitted with very little hesitation; if any hesitation is necessary, it is where additions occur. But when, on the contrary, such documents *contradict* received and published history, they require to be well and rather severely sifted, according to the circumstances. Manuscript materials are of all sorts—deliberate or careless—formal and attested records, or trifles never apparently intended for publication—the mere occupation of leisure hours, simple amusement, or diversion of ennui—some with good pretensions to knowledge, sagacity, and honesty—others with strong presumptions of ignorance, partiality, and contempt of truth. The

productions of the pen brought to light at a distant period, and of course, from whatever cause, unpublished near the time that they were committed to writing, are, some comparatively insignificant, others of obvious and high importance: some are withheld from tenderness for the character and feelings of living characters, or their connexions, sometimes from reasonable fear; others, because their own intrinsic credit was not sufficient to endure the light of day and the scrutiny which might be applied to them, when the means of detection, in the case of fiction, were known to exist and to be unanswerable. These observations apply with nearly equal force to books privately printed, or made rare by suppression, as any other mode of withdrawment or destruction. In the respects just mentioned, particularly in the last, books published in or near the age of their authors have a manifest advantage—we speak of justly approved works. They fairly and openly submit themselves to examination when it can be conducted with most effect. There is, indeed, a large number of writings never intended to get abroad, and which are only committed to paper from the necessity of such a mode of transmitting the required information. When this can be ascertained, their value is, in proportion to the matter, great and indisputable; their disclosures are often of the highest importance; and the light which they reflect upon past events frequently, and in some cases demonstrably, unravels interesting mysteries. In short, the value of the recondite sources which we have been considering is absolutely dependent upon circumstances; and there can hardly be a greater or more humiliating mistake, than to trust them in the mass without discrimination, and to look upon every manuscript or rare book as a historical treasure. We have ventured these observations, not only because they appear to apply in the way of a corrective to the Berlin Professor, but because there seems to be growing among ourselves a morbid taste for shaking and prostrating the commonly received facts of credible history by such and similar insufficient or doubtful means.

To give anything like an adequate account of the history which we have selected for review, would be a hopeless, at least endless, undertaking. It embraces, or rather flies over, a vast extent of historical matter, collected, digested, and arranged by a mind of no ordinary capacity and skill. We will not captiously question its general accuracy, but we must be permitted to say, that the result, where we have examined the author's statements with any minuteness and diligence, has somewhat shaken our confidence in the soundness of his narrative. And we must add, that the historian seems hardly to have dealt fairly

with his readers, in calling upon them to yield implicit acquiescence in very many representations, for which, with full opportunity to do it, he has not condescended to give any authority at all. His inattention to dates, one of the best criteria of historic accuracy, is hardly in any respect justifiable. The time is past when such liberties will be patiently submitted to, at least by British Protestants.

In the first volume, at page 75, and following, the Professor gives his solution of the question, why the revival of letters in the fifteenth century was productive of so contrary effects in two of the most important nations of Europe—in Italy, being abused to irreligion; in Germany, giving an impulse to devotion. His solution has met with more attention than we think it exactly entitled to; and it may serve for a general and almost constantly applicable remark, that on large and multifarious subjects, a man of reading and imagination may establish, with much plausibility, any theory to which his intellectual predilections may incline him. Ranke supposes that the fact, which appears so much in favour of Germany, arose principally from a certain spiritual mysticism which for a length of time prevailed in that country. The simple fact is, that when learning was driven from the east to the west, and found an asylum first in Italy, the material upon which it had to operate was, a national mind debased by a barbaric superstition, and by the profligacy naturally flowing from it. Another necessary consequence was, general hypocrisy among the higher and leading orders: and of all the forms of irreligion, none is so fixed and impenetrable as that which is generated by habitual hypocrisy. The great agent or engine, then, of revived learning did, and in its own nature could do, nothing more than add fresh power to that which was already in existence. Germany had the negative advantage of comparative freedom from the adventitious and cultivated iniquity, particularly the confirmed insincerity of her more civilized neighbour. Here the new stimulus to knowledge and learning failed to encounter the dead resistance and repulsion which the Italian climate presented. Above all, the simply negative advantage of the German mind secured the new power from absolute and most mischievous perversion. But the positive advantages of Germany, making due allowance for its religious condition, which, as of all the world besides, could be none of the best, were as decisive and important as could well be expected. Under a cloud, indeed, there was yet a considerable portion of Christian piety in that part of Europe: there were lights, "northern lights," as they might be called, in it; and among them, the highly meritorious individual, fami-

liarly denominated the *Lux Mundi* *— one, likewise, who escaped the Marian idolatry, which Thomas à Kempis, cited by Professor Ranke, did not, unless he be belied by the new Saint Liguori, in his "Glories of Mary," with which young gentlemen in Anglo-Romish seminaries are drugged. Germany, therefore, was far less unprepared for the improvement of the new gift than Italy; and if we add the important secondary and united cause, the invention of printing, which mainly belongs to her, we shall find still less difficulty in accounting for the far more salutary effect and use of learning there than in the regions south of the Alps. When the time appointed for an extended emancipation of Germany from Papal darkness and irreligion arrived, the great instrument who gave it a decisive commencement, was, indeed, unwittingly urged to the noble act of his first resistance to spiritual despotism by the profligate venality of certain of her religious operations—indulgences; and of these our author has spoken fairly and indignantly enough. But the views of Luther himself, at the time, were feeble and sufficiently indulgent; † and, among the mysterious overrulings of a Providence, which few are disposed to see, we owe it to the obstinate defence of their corruptions by the authors of them, that all thoughts of a ruinous peace were abandoned; the tide of divine truth set in with irresistible power, and overtopping the seven hills of the infatuated deceiver, spread fertility and spiritual joy over many nations.

In approaching the direct accounts of the pontiffs for the period concerned, which the reader would of course expect, we believe we express the result of his judgment after perusal, when we express ours, that they are deplorably sketchy, unequal, and oftentimes misleading; and in such cases almost universally in a direction not accordant with the most accurate principles. It was all fair enough to give up Alexander VI. to richly-earned infamy, as it is now the policy of Roman advocates to do: but it should be remembered that he is a good solid link in the chain of succession, even after that newly forged by the Council of Constance; and that, during his life, he was addressed as *Santissimus noster Dominus*, and performed all the acts with a present acquiescence in their validity, of the head (by some of his subjects deemed personally infallible at

* See, for Jo. Wesselus Hermanni, Oudin. de Script. Ecc. iii., coll. 2707, and following. His cotemporary and namesake, a German, often mistaken for him, may be added; as well other worthies in the "Testes Veritatis" of Flacius Illyricus.

† See his own acknowledgment to this purpose in his Colloquia, Medd., &c., by Rebenstock, Francf., tom. ii., fol. 24.

times) of the exclusively holy Catholic Church. Leo X., the first life formally given (p. 79, and onwards), is despatched smoothly enough.* Adrian VI., who followed, began as rigidly as would suit the necessity of raising the moral character of the Papal throne, and lived shortly enough not to lose the reputation which he had personally acquired. It might be imagined that it would have been in the way of a philosophy, not of a contracted description, to have dwelt rather minutely on the circumstances connected with the celebrated *Centum Gravamina* of the German nation and its rulers. They present volumes, and of far more meaning and moment than a vast quantity of secular matters.

But let us change our tone a little (and rejoice that we can), in speaking with almost unmingled approbation of the "analogies" with Protestantism, in the Roman Church, on the supremely important subject of justification by faith—the polar star and brightest jewel of the Reformation. (See p. 135, &c.) Here, the dictates of simple and truly rational Christianity compelled the better portion of a corrupt communion to side with their opponents, and bear a testimony in their favour, which, when their Church's influence upon them was restored, they shewed manifest signs of wishing to withdraw. And, indeed, it was very possible on that subject, as we see particularly in the Tridentine canons, to nullify a deal of preceding sound or passable doctrine, by a single sweeping qualification. But till the trial came, which was at the council referred to, good Catholics, as they were ambitious of being esteemed, were carried so near the truth by the current of common sense interpretation of Scripture, that, on the terms of man's return to his Maker's favour, they became almost Lutherans, or Christians, or Paulinists. † Though a minority, it was an honourable one; and it was from such that the ranks of restored Christianity were recruited. And even where this consequence did not follow, the sifting of the subject produced the good fruit of leading some partially conscientious members of the Roman Church to

* Much on the same principle as the elegant but uninforming "Life," by Roscoe.

† In one of the best works of the celebrated Bishop Atterbury, though written when he was young—his "Answer to some Considerations on the Spirit of Martin Luther," &c., a production of Abraham Woodhead—he thus turns upon the Papal calumniator:—"Luther teaches, indeed, that *fides sola justificat*, but not *solitaria*; that *faith alone* justifies, but not the *faith that is alone*. Good works are inseparable attendants upon this justifying faith, but they contribute nothing to the *act* of justification: they *make* not just, but are always with them that are made so. This is Luther's, was the Church of Rome's, and is now the Church of England's doctrine. If he will be pleased to attack it as such, it shall not want a defender."—1687, pp. 10, 11.

make the frequent attempts which the author records (p. 147, &c.), of reforming themselves. Some of these attempts were both unknown and are very remarkable. We pay a very willing debt of gratitude to the Professor for bringing them to light. At the same time, we must express some wonder that he should record so feebly a particular and highly important act of the pontificate of Paul III.; we refer to the *Consilium de Emendanda Ecclesia*, in 1537, a commission of nine, both cardinals and bishops, Carafa, a future pope, at the head, for the express purpose of enquiring into the abuses of the Roman court, and proposing the remedies. The work appears to have been done in good earnest. Acknowledgments or confessions were made of a formidable character, and such as could only be the effect either of laudable penitence or of salutary fear. Many of the delegated penitents were probably sincere—at least, at the time; but the sincerity of the principal member was ill proved by his condemning, when elevated to the Papal throne, the very act in which he took the lead as a contrite and confessed cardinal. Surely our philosophic historian might have afforded more space than a single paragraph (pp. 148-9) for so characteristic an act, in which his talent and delight in tracing effects to their causes might have pointed out the terrible alternative to corrupt Rome, of either suffering herself to be reformed by others, who had power, and were determined not to be satisfied without reformation, or of averting the public disgrace and damage, by reforming herself. Cardinal Pallavicino thinks the Pope and his council were great simpletons for being so easily frightened into a humiliation which told so ill afterwards. If he had lived at the time, he would probably have done the same thing. Like all other politicians, the spiritual ones of the time were obliged to obey the tide; and that tide, while at one time it compelled them to repent, or make a shew of repentance, in after times made or allowed them to repent of their repentance.

It is well known what pains were taken by the respectable Cardinal Quirini to make it appear that the Pope Paul IV. did not, in his damnatory index of books, condemn his own Consilium; but Schelhorn, in a particular treatise, fixed it unanswerably upon the pontiff. Since the time of both, the indefatigable Mansi, in his edition of Alex. Natalis, or Noel's Hist. Ecc., tom. xvii., pp. 604-5, has endeavoured to save his friend and his church from defeat, but with no success, as we could easily show, having canvassed his arguments; but we have not room now. The fact is, gentlemen of the Roman communion know very little about the proscribing catalogues of their own church,

and it is their interest to know less. They may know more if they will.

We have a long account of the necessarily unsuccessful Conference of Ratisbon, in 1541 (p. 154, &c.) Rome took effectual care to leave nothing uncertain in such demonstrations. At page 181, and onwards, we are greeted by an account of a movement, counter to the Reformation, by the new religious orders, particularly the Jesuits, with their great founder. It is pretty fair, though drawn from Jesuitic sources, for not only facts, but the interpretation of them.

At page 200, the Council of Trent, which began its actual sessions in 1545, makes its appearance. We must be careful how we embark on this sea, almost without a shore. At present—for we shall have to recur to it—it will be sufficient to observe, that it began under rather cheering auspices, in one respect. There was, as we learn from the present history, an apparent tendency towards the Protestant or Christian doctrine of Justification, in several members of the council: but these blossoms were soon nipped by the chilling blasts of secularity and perverse religion, which could not but generally prevail in so degenerate a Church as that of Rome.

We must hasten over the ground before us, and satisfy ourselves by observing, that the reader will learn, from the pages of Ranke (212-3), that the inquisition, even of Italy, was not quite so mild as is sometimes represented. At page 216, occur some observations concerning the Papal restrictions on literature, particularly religious, ripening into regular and extended catalogues—continued, indeed, to the present time—more correct and circumstantial than usual, but still far enough from the accuracy required and attainable.

The third book commences the more formal accounts of the Popes, from Paul III. to Paul IV.; and there is, doubtless, in them much to gratify and inform: we wish there were nothing to disappoint and mislead. It does appear strange to us, in a Professor of philosophy and literature, that the first formal attack made by the last of the Popes above mentioned, in the last year of his reign, on religious learning, and even secular, when the case required, by a catalogue of condemned books, issued by his own express authority, is passed over in complete silence. It is no very valid or decorous apology to say that the objects of condemnation were nothing better than volumes of controversial theology: since they are things of apprehended value alone which are matters of controversy.

Pius IV. was a Medici—a jovial man, and no friend to the inquisition, the darling of his predecessor. The almost single

distinction of his reign was, the closing assembly of the Council of Trent, which he is said to have desired—finally, at least—as the least of two necessary evils. (See p. 335, &c.) Of this anomalous synod, which "dragged its slow length along" for eighteen years, during which period it slept, if it were living, for four years the first time and for ten the next, and which only became acquainted with its own personal identity in the terminating stage of its existence, when the happy absence of the Protestants, who were not willing to be entrapped, set the holy fathers, with their head, at perfect liberty to do everything their own way—of this joyfully ended congress the Professor has given somewhat of a masterly sketch, and contributed some interesting materials: but we must warn the reader against a plain partiality of the liberal author in favour of the council; although, where he repeats the tears of joy and reconciliation which were shed by opponent fathers on the happy and unexpected conclusion of the whole,* he proceeds:—

"But if all the pliancy and dexterous policy which we have observed, had been needed to arrive at this result, we may be led to enquire, whether the efficiency of the council had not been thus necessarily impaired."

The just chastisement needed not so gentle an infliction. Any one who reads even in Pallavicino, or Paleotto, the *detail* of the proceedings, will see irresistibly that the Council of Trent, independently of its plain heresies and anathemas, was, at least, on a level with most secular conventions, in the secularity of its views, and the disgraceful artifice and intrigue by which they were pursued.

The reaction of the Papal influence is dated, by the historian, from this great event. That subject will come to be considered.

The next Pope we come to is Pius V., and eventually a saint. His pontificate was as remarkable for his personal acts, as his predecessor's for the acts of his time. He was a man of stern materials. His original biographers exult in the terror of his physiognomy. His short and energetic reign was mainly occupied by three objects—to procure the reception of the late council, to exterminate heresy, and to reduce the power of the Turk. But the field of heresy was that in which he laboured with most satisfaction, vigour, and activity. Ranke is very deficient and misleading here. He was apparently seduced, by the secret principle of preferring his new sources to the old, to an

* See Paleotto's and Servantio's graphic accounts of this scene, in "Mendham's Memoirs of the Council," p. 314.

injurious neglect of the latter. He does, indeed, refer to the first, the Italian biographer of Pius; but in stating and estimating the distinctive and strongly marked character and main performances of the Pope, he seems to be ignorant that there exists a perfectly indisputable collection of his own letters, which throw a most decisive and important light upon the spiritual hero's designs and achievements, and which, accordingly, have of late attracted much and deserved attention. An Englishman, and more, an English Protestant Catholic, has some right to quarrel with his present guide for saying nothing about the deposing, anathematizing bull, fulminated by the Jupiter Tonans of Italian mythology against the cotemporary and female sovereign of his country, and its deliverer from spiritual darkness and iniquity.* The observation relative to the Parisian massacre, which was prepared in the same laboratory, is characteristic enough to be quoted :—

"It cannot be proved that he (Pius) was privy to the preparations for the massacre of St. Bartholomew; but he did things which leave no doubt that he, as well as his successor, would have sanctioned them."

He did a little more: let any one read his letters. But the Professor proceeds :—

"How strange an union of singleness of purpose, magnanimity, austerity, and profound religious feeling, with sour bigotry, relentless hatred, and bloody persecution"—(pp. 383-4).

This reads rather oddly; but is philosophical enough.

We must get through the first volume with just referring to the names of Gregory XIII. and Sixtus V., however full of interesting matter; Popery girding itself to the contest with collected strength; national debt; jubilees and indulgences; reformed calendar; Irish rebellions; miracles; and the curia.

We cannot, however, leave the volume now open without relieving ourselves from the obligation of returning to one subject of it—the life of Sixtus V., which recurs at some length among the documents in the Appendix, page 115, &c.; because we wish to say something about it. It is, a criticism of Leti and Tempesti, biographers of Sixtus. Much in the fashion of the time, and much to the joy of Papal partisans, Ranke has endeavoured to seal the ruin of Leti's credibility, respecting whose work he does not appear to know that the Lausanne and Amsterdam editions differ much *in extent* from each other.

* A great deal more relative to this Pope's interference in English affairs would not have been beneath a philosopher's notice.

Leti certainly appears to have been too much addicted to colouring and improving (a process which some of his accusers might know was not singular); and this, we admit, is a serious fault. But we believe, that in the precise statement of important facts, Leti has never been convicted of sacrificing to his invention. In the present case, we have something like evidence to this fact. There is now on our table a well written Italian MS., the title of which we copy: "Vita del Sommo Pontifice Sisto V., composto da un' Autore Anonimo, e dicata al Merito Sublime del' Signor Antonio Nati Romano. L'Anno MDXCI." It is in folio, and contains one hundred and eighty-three folia. It is anonymous, as it professes to be; but its dedication is some warrant of credibility. Now, upon examination, it appears that much of Leti's history, and even the account of Sixtus's election, coincides, in whole sentences, and nearly verbatim, with this MS. We urge this fact simply as a presumption; and there we leave it. Literary scepticism is now on the advance pretty generally; but were it considered how invariably it has two edges, and that the wielder is frequently made to find that out, and feel it, it might decline a little in its popularity. Tempesti's "Life" might have been a very good one. His shew, or rather parade, of documents is very imposing: but he is a faithful servant of his church, and knows what to produce, and what to reserve; and the consequence is, ample information about pompous trifles, and but a scanty portion of what is really important. We are glad to see that the Professor's liberality has not obscured his perception of this peculiarity.

We hardly know how to encounter the second volume, and are obliged, contrary to our wishes, to be very general. The main subject of it is, the recovery by the Roman Church of large and important portions of power, numbers, and the reception of its faith, which it had lost by the Reformation. And it is willingly acknowledged, that the detail of events constituting that revulsion is given to an extent, with a particularity and precision, and with, we presume, a general accuracy, to be found in no other work. In the history of his own country, we mean Germany throughout, there is not, perhaps, another individual so profoundly and largely informed as the present, who thus well secures his title as Professor of *history*. Whether carried away by the interest of the matter, or from any other cause, he has narrated events which cannot but give pain to a Protestant, with the apparent complacency which might be expected from a Papist. The complexion of the occurrences recorded has accordingly touched a corresponding and loudly

vibrating chord in the Papal community. The glowing picture of the Protestant Professor has awakened ardent anticipations in Papal bosoms of a similar revival in the present times, which present to them so many encouraging signs. Visions of renewed glory for Rome have floated before the excited imaginations of her zealous votaries, and a Roman millennium has appeared in the horizon. This portion, therefore, in particular, of the historian's work was echoed in various promising ways. First, there was a French translation, well accommodated to the purpose intended, and which the original writer, in some sense, well deserved. Then appeared an article in the "Dublin Review," from the pen of a master, who may now have a see in Crete (celebrated for its particular regard to truth), and executed with especial care that it should reach its limits before new and lasting reverses made their appearance in the history. Something more substantial was simultaneously proceeding in Prussia itself. Baron Droste was taking the lead of a formidable conspiracy in favour of Popery, and for the subjugation of Protestantism; and what by stratagem on the one hand, and intimidation on the other, sanguine hopes were excited and entertained that he would do something. The liberality of the king and government, however, did not prevent their treating the traitor as he deserved. The communion still were not discouraged. The two rival annuals of Popery in England for 1839 were each embellished with portraits of their hero, and one with a life. The other prudently waited another year, and then broke its implied promise of a life. They have both, now united, been silent ever since, and left their champion "alone in his glory."

The prosperity which crowned the Papal efforts, in the latter part of the sixteenth century, to recover their prior dominion, is justly enough ascribed by the Professor, in a great measure, to the operations of the inquisition and the society of Jesus. It was to the savage and scientific barbarities of the former that Italy and Spain principally owed the restoration of the pontifical superstition. Germany, in great masses, fell prostrate before the auxiliary intrigues of the latter. Happy England held what she had gained, principally under her sovereign, Elizabeth; but not without a hard battle, and the slander of many, and fear was on every side, while the Papal head at Rome and the servile rulers of Europe conspired together to take away her life, and the life of purified Christianity in Britain. (See Psalm xxxi. 13).

And it is here, we confess, we have a serious difference with our historian. It was enough that he should give implicit

credit to Jesuitic historians respecting their own acts and concerns; but when, as respects England, in various parts, where the subject recurs, he resigns himself, as to leaders, to Allen, Parsons, Campion, Neal, and others of the same character and obligations, in preference to the legitimate historians of the times, particularly to the laborious and impartial Strype, who is not once named or alluded to, we began to feel a distrust, not only of the impartiality, but of the information of the Prussian Professor, which looks both backwards and forwards, and throws a general gloom of suspicion over the fidelity of his whole history. It may appear minute—but historians should be correct in all their statements—to observe that, in page 92, speaking of the English Papists, he writes: "Synods were held by stealth; a printing press was set up, first in a village near London, and afterwards in a lonely house in a neighbouring wood," &c. He should rather have said *Oxford.* Bartoli, the Jesuit, in his "History of the Society in England," writes: "Locum *Stonaria* nobilis matrona commodavit, quo nullus potuit, vel tutior deligi vel opportunior—Exemplaria libri sui tradit (Campianus) late quaquaversum per *collegia sedecim, aulas octo,* theatra, sedilia, ipsasque adeo Prædicantium ædes seminanda" —(pp. 132-3).*

But we cannot withhold something like indignation when the Papal slang is so far adopted as to talk of "*Catholicism* in its turn having its martyrs," and to refer for evidence to "Verstegan's Theatrum Crudelitatum," &c., pp. 168-9, closing with the sentimental remark—"It contains prints of unheard-of tortures; a terrific sight." Very true, if true; and worse, if undeserved. Now we suspect that we shall tell Professor Ranke news, when we inform him that Verstegan, who was a furious bigot, does not offer even the shadow of a *proof* for what he pourtrays—he gives little more than *a song;* and that he is not an original, but borrows his "terrific sight" from the "Ecclesiæ Ang. Trophæa" of Gregory XIII. of Rome, where some half-dozen English martyrs are depicted carrying their heads after decapitation; a strong proof of the credibility both of the original and the copyist, and likewise of the liberal wisdom of a historian in appealing to either!

A great quantity of respectable philosophy has been wasted

* Stonor is a few miles north of Henley-on-Thames, where Campion was harboured, and had a regular printing establishment. His "Decem Rationes" was first printed there. A binder betrayed the concern, and the stock was seized. Campion was taken at Lyford, the residence of Edward Yates. (See Bombini Vita Camp., xlii.; and both Sacchini's and More's Hist. Soc. Jesu. A.D. 1581.

in the endeavour to account for the reaction of Popery and its success, which have both formed so much of the preceding history. The philosophers have been a little too fond of *massifying* mankind—generalization is a fascinating employment. They have talked of geographical denominations, as if man, being a gregarious animal, portions of the race might be reckoned as so many head of rational cattle, all in one region going the same way, and sufficiently designated as being bounded by the Mediterranean, or the Baltic, or the British ocean—little condescending to consider what man is individually; what true or false religion is (unless all are the same); what is the effect of novelty; what the effect of the passing away of novelty; what the energies of a power unexpectedly humbled and impoverished; what the actual efforts of consummate skill put in exercise by insatiable cupidity, as well as by the shame of past defeat; what, in one word, the inclination of human nature, as it now is, towards true religion, on the one hand, and towards a religion which is not true, on the other.

In connexion with these observations, those who are conversant with the works of Lord Chancellor Bacon will probably call to mind a fine passage concerning the impediments to sound learning, arising from the "majesty of generalities" acting upon the pride of individuals who are not well guarded against the snare and abuse of a noble method. "Besides certain higher mysteries of pride (writes that almost *wisest of mankind*), generalities seem to have a dignity and solemnity, in that they do not put men in mind of their familiar actions, in that they have less affinity with arts mechanical and illiberal, in that they are not so subject to be controlled by persons of mean observation, in that they seem to teach men what they know not, and not to refer them to what they know: all which conditions directly feeding the humour of pride, particulars do want. *If truly collected* (he adds), they cannot be too much magnified."* Although the process of generalization be often highly useful, sometimes necessary, and always an almost infinite saving of time, it should never be forgotten that generalities are nothing severed from the *particulars* which constitute them; and that if these are unknown, or insufficiently or mistakenly included, a false conclusion is the inevitable consequence, however pompously it may be enounced.

We might here add some observations, very much needed, upon the manner in which some of our philosophical writers have undertaken to rectify modern prejudices relative to the

* Of the Interpretation of Nature, ch. xxii., Works, ed. 1803, vol. ii., pp. 164-5.

character of the Reformation, and that of the *principal human agent* in effecting it. The light which they assume to possess themselves, and wish to impart to others, may generally be resolved into vague, desultory principles, and a logic in their application not very intelligible and convincing. A great portion of their achievements may be traced to the simple process of selecting new guides; either such as their predecessors thought they had a right to reject or scruple, if acquainted with them, or, if discovered since, not always entitled to the highest confidence. In fact, to qualify a person to form a judgment deserving of respect, either of the Reformation or of the Saxon Reformer, it is essential that the records of the New Testament, received as true, and therefore divine, should form the basis and rule by which his judgment is determined. Any philosophic theory without this is, at best, dubious, and will most probably lead to a conclusion, or conclusions, both false and pernicious, to say nothing of their fatuity. We do not, therefore, exactly concur with the individuals in view, in the exalted opinion which they appear to entertain of themselves; and we do not regret that subjects of so much moment are in some measure taken out of their incompetent hands by such modern historians as Daubigne, and some others who might be named with honour. And we may add, from our present experience, that we cherish no very sanguine expectations from the translation of the particular labours of our Professor, on this subject, to an English soil. Germany has of late poured upon us a polluted theology, and we are not very desirous of being visited by streams of history equally polluted.

The close of this volume, to which we must now pass on, presents a novel scene, which seems to have terrified the ardent expectants of Rome; for they have not ventured to bring it forward. It is no other than a *reverse of the former successes of the Papacy*, under the title—"Restoration of the Balance of the Two Confessions" (p. 585, &c.) This was effected in a great measure by the victorious arms of the King of the Swedes and Goths, Gustavus Adolphus, and his successors. Popery, "just as it was preparing to sweep away the Protestant faith at its very sources, was checked in its career, and triumphantly forced back." Thus, as our author afterwards remarks (p. 592), "eternal barriers were erected against the progress of Catholicism, which has now its assigned and definite limits," &c.; and again, in the next page: "A current of opinions and of tastes, dangerous to the lofty unity claimed by the Church, has set in, and bears all before it," &c. About the middle of the seventeenth century, he says that the two pillars of Popery allied

themselves with the Protestants—"France undisguisedly, Spain in secret." We do not altogether take the learned Prussian for a prophet, or the son of a prophet; but we believe he has here faithfully chronicled the past. We do not ourselves pretend to that character; but we leave the omen to those who seem to be much delighted with such things when in their favour. Our hope and views are placed much higher; and in the storehouse of supernatural means we know that there are enough either to blast or to prosper any human scheme.

There is not much of the history in the concluding volume. The most attracting portion is the late addition at the close.

We will, however, first notice a statement at page 178, relative to the revocation of the edict of Nantes; and it is important to observe that it is introduced after an account of the Gallican liberties, and the rigour with which its articles were enforced, to the no little annoyance of Innocent XI.:—

"This state of confusion was aggravated by the resolution just then taken by Louis XIV., to prove the soundness of his orthodoxy by the barbarous extirpation of the Huguenots, which signalized his reign. He thought he rendered a great service to the Catholic Church. It was, indeed, said that Pope Innocent was a party to the design; but the fact is not so. The court of Rome would now have nothing to do with conversions wrought by armed apostles: 'that was not the method employed by Christ; men must be led, not dragged, into the temple.'"

Very smooth language, truly, which can be used whenever it costs nothing, and when his holiness found so tempting an opportunity of twitting the king on the very score which that king thought would most ingratiate him with the apostolic see. Ranke has not translated the last part of his authority, the "Relatione" of Venier: "in oltre parve importuno il tempo di guadagnar gli eretici all' ora che erano più bollenti le controversie col papa." But while the easy faith of the Professor would thus exonerate the Pope, he has put upon the king's back the burthen which more truly belongs to the bigoted Gallican and Papal clergy.

In what is, and is called "the conclusion," Ranke, after lessons which have taught him something, but not enough, presents his readers with his own panacea for all the evils of religion, which appears to be the total *abandonment of exclusiveness*; and then all, in beautiful harmony, will agree in believing everything or anything:—

"The more perfect apprehension of the spiritually true and immutable which lies at the bottom of all forms, but can be expressed by none in its whole infinite extent, must at length allay all animosities. High above all the contradictions which have agitated the minds

or alienated the hearts of men—let us never relinquish this hope—there dwells the unity of a simple consciousness of the being and the presence of God, reposing on itself in serene and inviolable security."

Here are words, and good sounding ones. If they have any other ultimate meaning than, that all the operations of the human mind and soul, as respects religion, are, or by some mysterious necessity will become, right, or that all faiths are the same, or agree in non-importance, we confess ourselves among the puzzled. Sure, however, we are, that ignorance of such a mockery of knowledge as this is even a negative wisdom; and we beg to suggest, that benefit may be obtained by more than suspect they need it, from the counsel of a wise man of antiquity: "Cease, my son, to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge," (Prov. xix. 27).

An Appendix of documents and criticism forms the main and most promising portion of this concluding volume. Though doubtless valuable, our expectations were not quite realized. We suppose the different views which the Professor and his reviewers may entertain on the quality of *what is important*, will account for this result. We certainly do want a little more secularity in our views, to come to a very complete accordance with our instructor.

At page 56 of the Appendix, which has a fresh set of pages, commences a pretty elaborate criticism of the two historians of the Council of Trent—Sarpi and Pallavicino. Respecting the first, he appears to us extravagantly and very unjustly hypercritical; probably to recommend his impartiality, and that he may afford a triumph to neither party. He has, however, fairly admitted, that the Italian apologist performs exactly the part of a special pleader, suppressing and distorting just that which suits his purpose; and substantiates against him the extraordinary and remarkable charge, that one of his "falsehoods is, in a certain sense, truer than truth itself" (p. 77). A slight mention follows of the annalist, Raynaldus, and the laborious collector, Le Plat, of neither of whom, particularly the latter, has he spoken with the respect which they deserve. The critic has likewise referred to Mendham's "Memoirs of the Council of Trent," and with more commendation than might have been expected; indeed, to so much purpose as to make the Papal reviewer of Ranke, in the "Dublin Review," feel himself under the necessity of absolutely falsifying its meaning, in order to defeat its effect.* The article

* See a letter on the subject in the "British Magazine" for 1839, vol. xv,. pp. 394-7.

of Ranke closes with some speculations relative to a new history of the council, which are plainly extravagant and not very discriminative.

"Remarks upon some of the historians of the Jesuits" occur at page 195, and onwards. Of Sacchini, the second of the regular historians, he observes, that he is "partial in the highest degree;" which, we presume, no one at all acquainted with the writer, or with Jesuitic morals, will controvert. We only wonder that, notwithstanding, Ranke has trusted him and his companions so much as he has. Certainly there are things to be learnt from the most consummate bigots, and fabricators likewise: but our friend seems to have an affectionate feeling towards them; in fact, has attempted to extricate them from difficulties, where most writers have considered the case perfectly hopeless.* There is, however, some ingenious matter in the discussion. Charles Dodd, author of the Romish ecclesiastical history of this country, now in progress of re-publication, has, in a particular work answering a Jesuit assailant, treated the principal historians of the society, particularly More, with remarkable disrespect.

We will detain the reader with only one more criticism on the articles of Professor Ranke's Appendix: the article selected purports to be a M.S. of the instruction, in Italian, given to Leo Allatius, librarian of the Vatican, for conveying to Rome the library of Heidelberg, which was presented by the Duke of Bavaria to the Pope. A Latin translation of the document has long been known, and is to be found in Gerdes. Miscell., iv. 575, Gron. Nov., &c., who there refers to Baumgartner, Relatio. de Lib. mem. iii. 522. It seems that a friend of our historian, rather, we presume, in the new German fashion, had attempted to throw a doubt upon its authenticity. The Italian original, inspected by Ranke, has set that doubt at rest. The critic, however, duly attends to his calling, by picking as many holes in it as, we may suppose, he could; and certainly he has detected some minor inaccuracies. But the body of the document is left untouched, and a curiosity it is, of which the author gives his reader no notion whatever. That reader, however, may right himself by going to Gerdes, or elsewhere, and there learn how careful the faithful Allatius was instructed to be, to secure such books or writings as might be made use of by the heretics, particularly bulls, breves, letters, and all other documents, old and new, relating to the pontifical see. His dignity was to dissemble

* The reader may just look back to the note, vol. i., p. 225.

the business upon which he came; and, while he scrupulously collected the more precious contents of the library, he was to forbear encumbering himself uselessly with the printed books. He was to pretend to be going to Munich instead of Rome; to disguise himself as a Venetian merchant; and to distribute sacred medals among the Austrian general's soldiers, to put them in good humour and prevent their being troublesome. These instructions and other means were so successful, that the literary treasures were at last securely lodged in the Roman prison-house, where they will be safe enough from doing any good.

We have now done, and have only to thank the historian for the pleasure and instruction which, however qualified, we have received from the perusal of a work of considerable erudition—a work which may be read with benefit by all who come to it with some ability to judge for themselves, and who will feel the necessity of regarding it simply as supplemental to more complete, fundamental, and, we may say, impartial history of the same events.*

It may not be without use to point out some errors of the press, which ought not to have been suffered to pass. In vol. i., page 144, *Tolengo* should be *Folengo*: it is right in the original. In the penultimate line of the note, page 196, *internis* should plainly be *in terris*: this mistake is in Ranke likewise. At page 207, near the bottom, we have *Tano* for *Fano*; belonging to the translator only. But the oddest oversight is in page 195 of the Appendix, where we read of "a priest after the order of *Abimelec*," &c. It must have required more than usual inacquaintance with Scripture, not to see at once that the proper name should be *Melchisedec*; and this inacquaintance unfortunately lies at the door of both original and translator.

---

* We are sadly in want of a respectable history of the modern Popes, in English. That portion of Bower's work is miserably contracted and unsatisfactory. It would form a very complete subject to begin with the present pontifical succession, which originated with the appointment of the Council of Constance, in the person of Martin V.; the very title of the present Papacy being founded on the acknowledgment of the superiority of a general council. There are abundant materials for such a production, and not very inaccessible. The "Bullarium Magnum" should be amply used, and the facts founded as much as possible on Papal authority. But the voluminous and pompous trifling, which constitutes so large a portion of most *Papal* "Lives of the Popes," should be gretaly abridged, or altogether omitted.

ART. III.—*The Principles of Population.* By A. ALISON, F.R.S., &c. London: Blackwood and Cadell. 1841.

POLITICAL economy, that great idol of modern liberals, has branched out into two main divisions—the theory of free trade, and of redundant population. Both of these, it cannot be doubted, have obtained a great influence on the public mind, and have even powerfully affected, of late years, the course of our national legislation. There has been, indeed, a partial reaction, and suspicions of their unsoundness are plainly on the increase among thinking men, especially those who feel the need of establishing society on moral and Christian foundations. But still there are many, we fear, among the higher and intellectual classes, who practically ascribe a greater importance to these fancied discoveries than to the inspired oracles of God. We have seen, in fact, in the Government pamphlet on Education, that while the benefit of instruction in sound Christian doctrine is passed by in silence, or covertly assailed, the diffusion of these and kindred theories among the poor is viewed as the great remedy for the evils of our land. It is high time, then, to submit them to a full and searching enquiry, on Christian principles, and, if they are proved unsound, to expose the spreading and dangerous falsehood. Nor is it enough merely to detect the false maxims they contain. Our aim should be to replace them by a sound and solid philosophy of social happiness, guided by the light of enlarged experience, and based on the sure lessons of God's holy word. To contribute to this great and needful work is the purpose of the following remarks; and the treatise of Mr. Alison on Population, itself devoted to the same object, will supply us with a rich and ample field for this interesting enquiry.

The first of the above theories—that of free trade, with its many corollaries, as held by Adam Smith and his disciples—does not come within the direct object of the present review. We shall content ourselves with summing it up in its one great maxim, always implied, though seldom expressed—that individual self-interest, unchecked by laws on the statute-book, or the Gospel in the heart, is the best and shortest road to national wealth and social prosperity. This, we are persuaded, is the true nature and demonstrable scope of the theory, when stripped of its external drapery. Where such is the conclusion, it is not hard to infer that some of the premises must be unsound; and, in fact, two of the ground pillars on which the system rests—the

definitions of value and of productive labour—are utterly empty and delusive.

Our present concern, however, is with the theory of population, as laid down by Mr. Malthus and his followers. This has obtained no less currency than the former, and not only ticians and legislators, but Christian divines, have lent it the sanction of their name. The economical works, for instance, of Dr. Chalmers are almost entirely based on the assumption of its truth. It has seemed, in short, to be in almost undisputed possession of the public mind; and though the feelings of many thoughtful and Christian minds have strongly reclaimed against its dogmas, little opposition has been offered in the way of direct argument.

The main outlines of this theory are generally known, but it may be well, before discussing their merit, to present them shortly to the view of our readers. The grand principle which forms its basis, is the ceaseless pressure of population upon subsistence. The numbers of a people, according to Mr. Malthus, tend to increase geometrically, by successive multiplication, the supply of food arithmetically, by successive addition. Hence the numbers to be fed perpetually tend to outstrip the supply of provisions, and penury and distress are the necessary consequence. This evil is inherent in the very constitution of things, and no expedient can fully remove it. Still, however, partial remedies may be found, in various checks to the redundance of population. These are of two classes, destructive and preventive. War, pestilence, famine, and disease, are checks of the former kind. They are a severe discipline to thin the numbers of an overgrown population, and to bring them within the limits of possible sustenance. Preventive checks are such as the abolition of poor laws, the discouragement of marriage among the poor, and other expedients of a similar nature. From the main theory, also, many secondary maxims are derived, which we cannot stay to enumerate—such as the uselessness of emigration, the comparative indifference to social happiness, of the mode of government, and the mischievous effect of general almsgiving.

Against this prevalent theory the work of Mr. Alison, now before us, is mainly directed. Its author is too well known to the public to need introducing to our readers; and the present volumes bear the stamp of the same vigorous thought, lively style, and patient research, which have secured him a place in the very first rank of modern historians. They are, indeed, as he intimates in his Preface, a kind of supplement to the "History of the Revolution," since they breathe the same spirit, and are directed to one common end. The refutation of the

Malthusian theory is, we think, full and conclusive, and is traced out, in the second volume, in a variety of important applications. But while we hail him gladly as an able pioneer in clearing away the rubbish of many popular delusions, we feel that very much remains to be done before the theory of population can be firmly established on a Christian basis, and stand forth to the eye in the simple majesty of eternal truth.

The general scope of Mr. Alison's work, and the objects which the author had in view, may be seen from the following striking paragraphs at the close of his Preface:—

"In the annals of the French Revolution, and its consequences on the subsequent transactions of mankind, it was the object of the author to unfold the moral laws which regulate the political affairs of nations and illustrate the secret working of Supreme Intelligence, acting through the voluntary acts of free agents, on the mighty theatre of human events. He has endeavoured to trace through an infinite variety of details, military, political, and diplomatic, the provision made by Providence, both for the moral retribution of nations and the general advancement of the species; and to show that while signal wickedness or strenuous performance of duty, by communities or their rulers, seldom fail in the end, even in this scene of probation, to work out their appropriate reward or punishment, the Great Architect of the universe overrules both to the ultimate good of man, and builds up, alike from the wisdom and folly, the virtues and the vices of men, amidst the chastisement and reward, the elevation and destruction of nations—the mighty fabric of general and progressive improvement.

"It is the aim of the author, in the following pages, to show that the same invisible hand and irresistible agency directs and pervades the social destinies of the species; that in the progressive changes which occur in the desires and habits, the moving springs of mankind, are to be found the nicest adaptation of the ruling principle, at all periods, to the circumstances in which the race is placed, and their ultimate advancement; that there is no permanent or lasting cause of distress which presses on the human species in any changes of its progress; that the deviations from this order, which are everywhere conspicious arise from the errors, the sins, and the corruptions of men; that in the consequences of these iniquities, however, there is established an unseen agency, destined for their removal or punishment; and that the only means of avoiding the otherwise inevitable retribution, is to be found in the general adoption by man, in his social relations with man, not less than by nation in its political intercourse with nation, of those principles of justice and benevolence which are unfolded in the Christian dispensation. In both, the same provision is to be observed for the combination of justice to individual men, or separate nations, with the progressive advancement of the species; and the author will not deem his labour and reflection for thirty years thrown away, if they are instrumental in illustrating the intentions of God in the moral works of nature; and if they tend to deduce, from an infi-

nity of details, military, political, and historical, in the one work, and statistical, geographical, and economical in the other, the common principles of SUPREME WISDOM, HUMAN CORRUPTION, SPIRITUAL REGENERATION, AND CHRISTIAN CHARITY."

Under this happy augury the work begins, and in some good measure fulfils its noble purpose. It would detain us too long to quote half the striking and eloquent passages which it contains, bearing on the most various topics of social economy, and illustrated by copious facts drawn from the original authorities. We must, though with great reluctance, forbear to notice the interesting remarks, in the second volume, on the management of the poor, and legal provision for their wants, on establishments, education, and colonies, all of which will repay a careful and frequent perusal. We shall pass over his opening chapter on the early increase of mankind, though full of important statements, and proceed to those in which he directly grapples with the Malthusian theory. And in the brief survey which we must take even of these, we shall present the arguments of our author in a somewhat different order, and one more favourable, in our view, to a full apprehension of their force and completeness.

The grand evil, then, on the Malthusian theory, which impends over society, like the sword of Damocles or the stone of Sisyphus, is the pressure of a redundant population, resulting from its law of geometrical increase. The following paragraph of Mr. Malthus (v. i. p. 10), will explain the argument:—

"Let us call the population of this island eleven millions, and suppose the present produce equal to the easy support of such a number. In the first twenty-five years the population would be doubled, and the food being also doubled, the means of subsistence would be equal. In the next twenty-five years the population would be forty-four millions, and the subsistence only equal to the support of thirty-three millions. In the next period the population would be eighty-eight millions, and the means of subsistence equal to the support of half that number. Taking the whole earth, instead of the island—emigration would of course be included—and supposing the present population one thousand millions, the human species would increase as the numbers 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, and subsistence as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. In two centuries the population would be to the means of subsistence as 256 to 9; in three centuries, 4,096 to 13; and in two thousand years, the difference would be almost incalculable."

Now to meet this, at first sight, alarming calculation, let us first enquire into the possible population which the earth can support, that we may know how far the imaginary danger is real, or, if real, how soon it is likely to occur. The habitable world (Mr. Alison observes) contains 37,678,000 geographical square

miles, of which probably twenty millions admit of full cultivation. Adopting an estimate of one-third for superfluities or pasture, one-third under wheat, and one-third under potatoe cultivation, or others of equal fertility, an acre on the average would support four persons. A geographical square mile contains about 850 acres, or would support about 3,400 persons. Hence the total population which the earth might support would be sixty-eight thousand millions, or probably at least eighty times its present population.

It is evident then, that, even adopting the theoretical rule of increase assumed by Mr. Malthus, the danger of the earth at large being overpeopled, is, at least, not very imminent, and that near two centuries must elapse before it could take place. The Christian, then, may relieve himself from any fear of evil from a source so contingent and remote. He cannot tell but that, before its arrival, the trump of the archangel may sound, and introduce mankind into a state entirely new, and where all previous calculations will prove empty and unmeaning. The immediate hand of God may thus suddenly sweep away these cobweb theories of man, by which, with an unbelieving fear, he would guard against infringing on the too narrow limits of his Creator's bounty.

But if even this period appear short, and the danger still real, let us next enquire how far the actual increase of mankind, under such checks alone as are natural and spontaneous, accords with the suggested geometrical scale. On this head Mr. Alison adduces a great variety of striking and important facts. First, to take a case the most favourable to increasing numbers, the United States, the free population in 1820 was 9,637,000, and in 1828 was 11,348,000, which gives thirty-four years for the time of doubling. And yet here the numbers are increased by a rapid immigration of European settlers. But this is an extreme case, with regard to the actual course of human increase; there are many other facts of a very different kind:—

"The inhabitants of Britain, in the time of Cæsar, were about 700,000; during the Heptarchy its population was still smaller; and in the time of Henry V., the whole island did not contain above two and a half millions. Thus, in fifteen centuries the numbers of the people were not increased fourfold."

"Sweden still suffers from the want of a rural population; and notwithstanding the immense extent and almost uniform fertility of Russia, its inhabitants, till the last century, were extremely scanty; and provinces, larger than France and Britain put together, still remain in its European dominions destitute of inhabitants. The Turkish empire, which in Europe and Asia embraces 815,000 square miles, contains only twenty-five millions of inhabitants, being at the rate of twenty-eight

to the square mile, certainly not a fifth part of the population it contained in the days of the Roman and Persian empires (and, it may be added, little more than an hundredth of what it might possibly support.) Barbary once contained probably from eight to ten millions; now it is almost entirely desert. Persia, in the time of Alexander's invasion, had a population of not less than sixty millions; now it does not contain above six or eight, and the uncultivated are to the cultivated acres as ten to one. The inhabitants of Spain are now eleven millions and a half; in former times their number was probably double. Eleven hundred ruined villages are to be found in Arragon, Catalonia, Leon, Valentia, and Old and New Castile. A part of the kingdom of Salamanca formerly comprised 748 villages—of these only 333 remain: a part of the bishopric, 127 villages, of which only thirteen remain. The kingdom of Grenada, under the Moors, comprised three millions of inhabitants; its present number are less then two-thirds of a million."

From these and many other facts, it is clear that the population of many parts of the world, instead of advancing, has greatly declined, and probably, on the whole, exceeds in only a slight proportion that of ancient times; and that we are far within the limits of fact, if, instead of supposing it to double in twenty-five years, we substitute a period of two centuries. In this case, from what has been already shown, it is plain that more than 1,200 years must pass before it can reach the limit of possible subsistence.

It is true that it may be rejoined, that in the above cases many powerful causes, or, in the language of the theory, destructive checks, have been in operation, which have served to reduce the numbers below their former, or, at least, below their possible amount. To this, however, it is enough to reply, that those checks, whatever they were, have been unforced and spontaneous, and not the artificial effects of human theories; that they have prevailed as widely, and operated as continually, as the animal instincts themselves, and therefore have an equal claim to be taken as essential elements in the great problem; and that the wars, the oppression, and the disease, which have mainly concurred in these results, have seldom, or rather never, been occasioned by a population really redundant, but solely by the vices, superstitions, and passions of men. The alleged danger, then, from this pressure of numbers on subsistence, when laid down as a necessary effect of the laws of increase, is purely chimerical, and only serves to blind us to the true sources of the evils which afflict mankind.

We may proceed with our author a step further. Not only the actual history of mankind may show us how far population has ever been from approaching the limits of possible subsistence, but the nature of society may prove that the geometrical

law of increase is untrue. As the numbers of a nation increase, society assumes a new form, and fresh causes come into operation, as simple, and constant, and instinctive, as the dreaded principle itself, and which directly counteract its influence. Among these our author enumerates artificial wants, habits of foresight, the gradation of ranks, the development of reason, the desire of advancement in society, the effects of general education, and the still wider effects of religious instruction. The animal nature is but a small part of man's complex being, and when, as society grows in numbers, the other elements of his nature are developed, and come instinctively into play, a powerful and antagonist system of influences begins to work, which steadily limits the rapid growth of population. It is only where the unnatural institutions of society, the oppressions of governments, or some deadly and blighting superstition, hinder the action of these causes, that their due balance is deranged, and population follows a diseased and unwholesome course.

But it may be urged, as a last resort, that however these causes, in the long run, may reduce within narrow and safe bounds the increase of the numbers of mankind, still that this increase, at each particular stage, follows a different and faster law than that of the increase of subsistence, and thus that an incipient pressure, at least, must always exist, and form a great and positive evil. If, in fact, the one follow a geometrical, and the other an arithmetical proportion, this pressure will be a necessary consequence. To this the remarks of our author, in his second chapter, furnish a complete reply. The Malthusian hypothesis commits the great oversight of leaving the increase of subsistence unconnected by any law of relation, with the amount of labour bestowed upon the soil. Yet this is clearly its natural measure. The labour of one man, as Mr. Alison observes, might either have been able to procure a bare provision, or less, or more. In the two first cases, society could never have increased at all; the last, then, is plainly the actual relation between them. Hence the more labourers are occupied on the soil, the greater the surplus of provision which is obtained. And this is confirmed by wide and uniform experience. Instead of an increasing population forcing men from arts and manufactures back to the culture of the ground, as the sole means of obtaining a bare supply of food, it is the very stage in which the proportion of the population of cities to that of the country is the largest. This one remark is fatal to the Malthusian doctrine. In fact, the amount of subsistence possible to be raised must depend on three elements—the number of the labourers employed; the skill which guides their labour, and which commonly increases

with their numbers; and in the last stage, which verges on the utmost limits of population, the lessening portion of land which each can have to till. The first of these gives the geometrical proportion of the numbers themselves, the second multiplies it by a factor which increases, and the third by one which diminishes in proportion to the interval of time. Till, then, we approach somewhere near to the limits of extreme cultivation, the food possible to be raised, instead of an arithmetical, has a more than geometrical increase. This fact, which Mr. Alison establishes by a great variety of conclusive evidence, completely and finally extinguishes the rival theory.

It may be at once curious and interesting to contrast the confident tone of some Malthusian economists with the following just and able remarks of our author. We will first quote a paragraph from a writer of some note about twenty years ago:—

"The remaining topics of dissension among the scientific are of much less moment, as well as much less numerous, than has been represented by their common adversaries. In most important particulars there is no longer any difference of opinion; the sources and means of production—the nature of commerce—the benefits of freedom, industry, and division of labour—the nature and uses of money—the operation of credit—the injurious effect of prohibition, monopoly, taxation, and generally of the interference of authority—*the constant pressure of population on the means of subsistence—all these are placed beyond doubt or controversy.*"—*Prinsep's Translation of Say, Preface.*

Let us now hear the nervous remarks of our author:—

"'Whatever (says Dr. Johnson) makes the past or the future predominate over the present, exalts us in the scale of thinking beings.' When future ages shall come to reflect on the fact, that for forty years the wisest philosophers and the ablest statesmen, in an age boasting of the highest intellectual acquirements, implicitly adopted a theory of the impossibility of making subsistence keep pace with population, which is decidedly contrary to the experience of every age, and inconsistent with the state which society had assumed in the very country where the doctrine originated, they will regard this as one of the most singular instances of the truth of the saying, and perhaps arrive at the conclusion, that the most enlightened age is incapable of resisting the weight of considerations which strike the senses. It was by fixing their minds on present objects, and reasoning on mankind in general, from the example of the Irish poor and the American colonies, that two generations have been imbued with this extraordinary delusion. Struck with the importance of those phenomena, they have overlooked alike the history of the nations who have preceded, and the capacities for increase provided for those who are to follow them. The rapidity of progress in those two countries, which, as will be amply shown in the sequel, has arisen from extraneous and transitory causes, has been considered

as the ordinary law of human increase; they have been regarded not as the exception, but as the rule. And, what is worthy of observation, these principles were generally conceived indisputable, just because the history of the world had afforded no instance in which their error could be brought to the test; the powers of production had everywhere so completely outstripped those of population, that their relative proportion was overlooked; the strength of the moral barriers, provided against an over increase of mankind, was such that it was never suspected how far even the most peopled communities were within the physical bounds to their further increase; and *man was led to doubt the bounty of his Creator, from the magnitude of that very bounty having everywhere prevented him from approaching its limits.*"

We have thus given a short sketch of Mr. Alison's refutation of the Malthusian dogmas. Those readers who wish to see it fully developed must consult the work itself, where they will find the results of wide and patient research, embodied in a most interesting form, and lit up with many passages of fervid and striking eloquence.

But while we offer it this willing tribute of praise, and view our author as an admirable pioneer to clear away the rubbish of prevalent delusions, we feel that there are higher and nobler aspects of this great subject, which even his work fails to afford. The Church of God, in our days, has too long been passive under the incubus of alien and earth-born theories, which she has suffered to gain currency among her children, through her neglect of that fulness of divine truth of which she is the appointed steward and guardian. It is high time that she resume her office, and spread the light of a sound and Christian philosophy, drawn from the inspired word, over those fields of thought which have been given up to the infidel speculations of earthly-minded men. Till some one shall arise who may prosecute fully this great work, we must content ourselves with giving a few hints towards such a theory, and leave them to be matured in the reflections of the thoughtful reader.

The first essential, then, towards a solid and Christian theory of population, is to place the fence of a holy sacredness around the whole subject. There is no field of thought more dangerous, when approached in a spirit of coarse expediency or careless irreverence. Indeed, to minds imbued with Christian delicacy, the tone of modern economists on this topic is miserably sickening and repulsive. To degrade the highest mystery of God's creating wisdom and enlarging providence to the level of mere questions of arithmetic, or the instincts of the beasts that perish, is a deadly blight that withers all purity and dignity of thought, and taints the soul with the mallaria of a ruinous infection. We

must begin by reversing this deadly spell. We must dissolve the glutinous charm of coarse and sensual speculations, by gazing on the countenance of heavenly truth, and receiving the lustral drops which she sprinkles from her pure and living fountain. It must be remembered, in short, that marriage and birth, and all the mystery of human life, is placed in the word of God under the shield of a sevenfold consecration, and that to approach them, not merely with a light and irreverent, but even with a cold and heartless tone, is an open offence against the dignity of man, and covert sacrilege against his Maker.

Having thus prepared the way, by repelling the profane intruders upon holy ground, the next step must be to obtain some clear first principle, some presiding law of human population. And this is supplied to us in the very first page of revelation. We there learn that human nature, by God's creating ordinance, was distinguished from the angelic by mysterious capacities of endless increase, and thus became a still wider and boundless field for the ever unfolding display of the divine perfections. Immortal beings, framed in the image of their Maker, were thus to be successively trained up for his heavenly kingdom; and a special ordinance, whose elements were entwined of holiness and love, was appointed for the fulfilment of this high purpose of God's manifold wisdom.

The ruin of the fall was in no aspect more fearful than in the change which it wrought in this first ordinance of God. Its two great elements were displaced by loathsome counterfeits—pride usurping the place of holiness, sensual appetite that of heavenly love. Spiritual and carnal wickedness revelled in the spoils of this goodly temple, which had been reared for the divine glory in the growing numbers and multiplying happiness of mankind. And henceforward the province of a true philosophy of population is to trace the steps by which that sacred ordinance is redeemed from its deep and foul debasement, till it is finally recovered to more than its original holiness and beauty. Two main stages in this great process of mercy are distinctly marked —the first before, and the other since, the coming of the world's Redeemer.

It is clear that the spirit and tendency of the earlier dispensations, before the coming of our Lord, included direct and powerful encouragement to marriage, with a severe guard against its grosser and fouler corruptions, but with as marked a forbearance towards those which were less deep and glaring. Two reasons may be assigned for this prominent feature.

The first is of a self-evident kind. It was only by the extensive peopling of the world that a theatre could be formed

for the full display of God's righteous providence and redeeming grace; and hence, in the earlier days of mankind, and till the natural subjugation of the earth was in some measure complete, there was a direct and most important object to be answered, by impressing this character on the Divine revelations.

The second reason is of a deeper kind, and requires more of spiritual discernment to understand. To see its nature fully, we must remember that, under the old covenant, righteousness and holiness were more fully revealed than grace and love. The stern discipline of law was to precede the free gospel of grace; the bondage of the servant, the shadows of the night, were to usher in the day-spring of Christian and filial freedom. But for this very reason a counterpoise was needed for the healthy and wholesome training of the soul. Evil is like the tossing waves of the sea; strife and conflict are the elements of its very being; truth and goodness are like the rainbow hues of heaven's light, and each of their various forms can only be fully unfolded in harmony with all the rest. Hence a dispensation of rigid and stern severity needed some balance of gentleness and grace. And this was impressed on it by the nature of all the Divine revelations which bore on this sacred ordinance of marriage. Corrupted as it was most foully, its love extinct under the power of selfishness, ambition, and pride; its holiness stifled by forms of evil too fearful to name—both elements needed alike to be restored. But while its holiness was partially testified by the intense stamp of reprobation put on fouler shapes of sin, the whole current of revelation on this point was made to bear against the selfish pride which rejected, rather than against the taints which corrupted, the ordinance itself. In the first promise in paradise, the covenant with Noah and with Abraham, the histories of the patriarchs, and the ordinances of the law, this common purpose may be seen to prevail. With barely enough of restraint and severity to bear witness to the Divine holiness, there is one marked and constant aim to revive the domestic affections which were ready to expire, and to turn the current of man's thought from the pursuits of ambition, violence, and pride, into the retreats of family union, and the gentle channels of filial, conjugal, and parental love. And thus while the warp of revelation was purposely framed of the stern righteousness of the Sovereign Judge, the woof was beautifully varied with all the blending forms of human tenderness.

After the coming of the Messiah, with a great variation in the dispensation, there followed also an entire contrast in the steps employed for the full redemption of marriage to its true dignity. The world was now widely peopled, and the first mo-

tive which before existed for its direct encouragement was now added to the opposite scale. The world was peopled, but, alas, with idolators, with unbelievers, with the veriest bond-slaves of ignorance and lust. It became the wisdom of God, in providing a fresh abode for his truth, to concentrate all the thoughts of his servants on the great work of raising the world from its darkness, and restoring the lost image of their Maker to the millions who were already born. The fulness of grace, also, in the Gospel of Christ, standing out in such full contrast to the Mosaic covenant, needed some internal counterpoise. There needed some ceaseless witness to the holiness of its Author, and a practical barrier against that licentiousness which perverts the Gospel and rebels against its authority, while it professes to accept its grace. Besides, marriage, as it actually existed both among Gentiles and Jews, had little but the name in common with the sacred ordinance of God. To Him who cannot be deceived with words and names, but who searches the inmost heart, it must have been little else than a loathsome parody upon the high purpose of his creating love. Marriage, in its holy and Christian ideal, and the marriages of the heathen world, had scarcely more concord than Christ with Belial. Hence the wisdom of our Divine Law-giver, for the very redemption of his own ordinance to its true dignity, and as a balance to the freeness of the new covenant, saw fit to impress on the New Testament Scriptures a tone of clear discouragement of the ordinance *in its existing form*. The fact is plain to every unbiassed reader, and nothing but the perversion of this feature by the apostasy of the latter times could have blinded the eyes of any thoughtful Christian to this evident truth. Nor was this feature impressed only on the sacred page. The Holy Spirit of God himself unfolded the lesson in the hearts of the early Church. While the Gospel was preached to a benighted world in all its freeness, the holiness which it wrought in those who received it was by Him guided and concentrated in one mighty assault against the strongholds of sensual appetite and lust, and not even the sacred title under which they had masked their true hideousness was suffered to deter the militant army of faith from its impetuous siege against those fortresses of corruption.

Those Christians of the present day who bestow a passing contemptuous glance upon this feature of the primitive Church, and confound it with predicted apostasy of later times, which grew *out of its abuse*, show a grievous lack of spiritual discernment. They might see, if they would reflect more deeply, that a spirit so universal in the Church, so opposed alike to the com-

mon tendencies of nature and to the current of heathenism, so much in harmony with the first aspect of the apostolic writings, could only have its source *at first* in the secret and overruling power of the Spirit of God, however it might be afterwards perverted by the pride of man. They are little aware how much those fruits of domestic purity and love which they admire, and which they contrast with the ascetic superstition of the first ages, are themselves owing to the power of that very Spirit in cleansing and elevating the springs of thought, and reviving, *what was extinct in heathen marriage*, something of the virgin purity of heavenly love. It was this stern and unflinching controversy waged by the Church, which alone could stem the overwhelming tide of heathen impurity and sensual debasement, and win back for God's dishonoured ordinance some elements of its true and original holiness, and some bright earnests of its eternal beauty. The Church now has entered into their labours; but let us beware of despising the keenness of their ploughshare, while we are privileged to reap so largely the harvest which they have sown.

It would detain us too long to pursue this sketch into further details; to show how this impulse of holiness, struggling mightily with the foul tide of corruption, was perverted into one grand source of self-righteous pride—how it became the key-stone in that temple of Baal which gathered upon it, one after one, the marks of the predicted apostasy of the mystic Babylon; to explain how the Reformation, while it broke the spell of monastic will worship and reclaimed its due honour to marriage, failed in unfolding this part of divine truth in its balanced harmony, and left the Church exposed to a fresh tide of heathenism, masked under Christian forms; to show how widely this relapse has really taken place; how marriage is come, even in Christian lands, to be viewed once again as a mere form of civil society—is debased into a matter of mere registration, of custom, or inclination, or convenience, and stripped of all its high and holy dignity; how the woful effect has been to set loose the flood-gates of sensual appetite on every side, to deluge us with a self-willed and lawless population, born in corruption, untrained by discipline, nursed in wretchedness and crime, and bringing rottenness into the very pillars of the State; to trace its last effect, in giving birth to a spurious theory of heartless calculations—a theory which would vanquish the power of appetite by the ledger of a cold self-interest, and devolve on Mammon the hopeful task of casting out Belial—a theory which, instead of awakening the conscience to the foul guilt of profaning a divine ordinance, injects into the soul the foolish

and unbelieving fear of our outstripping the too scanty limits of our Maker's bounty. But we have not room to enlarge on a subject which may seem almost beyond the province of a mere review. Let the Church only fulfil her high office—let her stem boldly the downward current of the age—let her teach her sons and daughters, whether rich or poor, that marriage, far from being a mere matter of civil registration, to be really Christian, involves in it far more than even a solemn form and priestly benediction, and that its triple wreath is entwined of the holiness of Paradise, the love of Calvary, and the brightness of a glory yet unrevealed;—let the Church of God established in our borders fulfil this great office of love, and an antidote will be found for the diseases of the land, which all the maxims of a coarse and grovelling expediency must ever fail to supply.

ART. IV.—*History of the Contest between Thomas à Becket and Henry II. Hurrell Froude's Works.* Second part. Vol. 2. London: Rivingtons. 1840.

2. *The Early English Church.* By EDWARD CHURTON, M.A., Rector of Crayke, Durham. London: Burns. 1840.

WHEN we first saw the goodly volume in which Mr. Froude's "History of the Contest between Thomas à Becket and Henry II." is contained, we flattered ourselves, that although we might, perhaps, disagree with some of the conclusions to which that clever, but too hasty deductionist might have come, yet that there would be no chance of combating his premises or questioning his authorities; and that his work would prove to be a mine of facts, diligently and laboriously investigated, authorities carefully weighed, and much information collated from every cotemporary source, as to the motives and acts of the archbishop. We did not, however, expect that Mr. Froude's editors would have given to the world, under such an alluring title, a mere re-translation and re-arrangement of some of the well known epistles, or that Mr. Froude himself would have been content with the epistles as he found them in the Brussels edition—an edition confessedly compiled by a party, and for a party purpose, and which, from comparison with extant MSS., it is not possible to look upon as other than designedly faulty. Besides the translations, Mr. Froude's portion of the history does not extend beyond the hundred and thirteenth page—about one-fifth of the work—the remainder of the history being

concocted by some unknown hand. The pith, however, of the book, as far as novelties go, is to be found in the extracts, in the form of appendices, given from the "British Magazine," in which we have a full and particular account of what the best authorities are which ought to be referred to, and the least possible reference to them where they ought to be cited. As elegant and correct translations of these letters, we feel grateful to his editors for their making them thus generally known. Valuable as are the epistles—and indispensable they are to forming a just view of the transactions of this period—yet they ought always to be compared with the cotemporary biographies and chronicles, and the party feelings of the writers taken into account, ere any deductions are arrived at. And although it may be much more easy to consult Lupus's printed edition of the epistles than a MS. copy, yet it should be borne in mind that nearly half a hundred letters, most of them of great importance, are to be found in the MS. copies of the letters, which are not to be seen in the edition of Lupus, from which, and from the biography of Fitzstephen, the avowed advocate of Becket, and almost the only cotemporary writer used by Mr. Froude in his history, he and his continuator have arrived at several novel conclusions, in our opinion unnecessary and unfounded. Whilst, then, we comment on these novelties, we will endeavour to give such an account of the leading incidents in the life of Becket as can be found in and proved by the now existing works of his cotemporaries, and other writings either composed or published previous to the compilation of that edition of the epistles from which Mr. Froude has so correctly and elegantly translated—writers of the primate's own party, many of them his own familiar friends, and fellow sufferers with him in the persecution.

The chief authority, then, is that mass of above four hundred and fifty letters called the "Divi Thomæ Epistolæ," written by the principal men of Europe between the years 1165 and 1172. By whom these letters were arranged is a matter of doubt, though the work is generally ascribed to John of Salisbury; their genuineness and authenticity is unquestionable, their value self-evident. These letters, or rather some of them, to the number of four hundred and thirty-five, were edited, under Papal authority, by Christianus Lupus, at Brussels, in the year 1682, professedly from the MSS. in the Vatican. Of them very many valuable MSS. still exist in this country, among which may be particularly mentioned the copy among the Cotton MSS., in the British Museum; that among the Parker MSS., at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; and that among the Lumley

MSS., at Lambeth Palace.* Prefixed to the Brussels edition is the "Quadrilogus," or quadripartite history of Becket, the work of four of that prelate's friends—Herbert de Boscham, John of Salisbury, William of Canterbury, and Alan, Abbot of Tewkesbury. A manuscript of part of this work exists at Oxford, but as we have not been able to collate it, we must be content to quote from the printed edition. In the library of Sion College, and in the Arundel collection in the British Museum, are MS. copies of that life of Becket which was composed by Grim or Grime (the monk of Canterbury who endeavoured to shield off the sword of the assassin by the interposition of his own arm). Of the latter MS. we have been enabled to consult a transcript, through the kindness of one of the librarians of the Museum. Among the MSS. at Lambeth are two cotemporary biographies of Becket—the one, which we will refer to as MS. Lamb. A, professedly compiled by an eye-witness of the greater part of the events recorded by him; the other, evidently the portion of a MS. of Fitzstephen's life of the primate, unfortunately brought to an abrupt conclusion at the moment of his flight from Northampton. Add to these the "Chronicle," of Gervase; the "History of England," by William of Newborough; the "Imagines Historiarum," of Radulphus de Diceto; the "Lives of the Abbots of St. Alban's," by Matthew Paris; and the "Vita et Processus," published in 1495, at Paris. There is also a little book in English, in the British Museum, called "The Life and Ecclesiastical History of St. Thomas of Canterbury," edited at Cologne in the year 1639, containing translations of many of the epistles, and bearing the imprimatur of the Pope; in many parts a close and accurate translation of Fitzstephen's biography.

Every fact contained in such works as these, that in any way makes against the archbishop, may be strictly depended on, and cited without deduction; whilst everything that at all partakes of panegyric must be received with caution, and only after careful comparison with other sources. This, indeed, would be the chief duty of any one who would now sit down to write a biography of Becket; he would have no necessity to search

* Cottonian MSS., Claudius, b. ii., containing fifty-three letters not in the Brussels edition. Parker MSS., Corp. Chris. Coll., Cambridge, containing twenty-seven letters not printed. MSS. Lambeth, one hundred and twenty-six, contains many not printed, but is sadly mutilated both in the beginning and end. There are also copies of the letters among the Arundel and the Royal MSS., and in the Bodleian, at Oxford. The Cotton, Lumley, and Royal MS. we have been enabled to refer to; and we did hope to have examined those at Oxford and Cambridge, but were unable to do so in time for the appearance of this number.

after new facts, but must confine his attention to a careful weighing of the authorities on which the host of already received incidents depends, and to the considering how far the authority of one historian, or writer of a letter, may be admitted, in opposition to the silence of the rest, or be preferred before the assertions of another. With respect in particular to the letters, wherever he has occasion to refer to one, not in the printed edition, but which is extant in any one of our MSS., he must not be content with the single authority of the Arundel, or the Parker, or any one solitary MS., but carefully trace its existence through as many as he can. And should he feel inclined to quote from the Cottonian collection, he must be doubly careful in his researches, not because it is of less authority than either the Vatican or any other MS., but because, on account of its containing some letters hardly so favourable as those in the Vatican to either Becket or the Pope, it is in great disfavour with the admirers of the one and the followers of the other. Our purpose is more confined; it is to show what was the view entertained by those, for the most part friendly authorities, already enumerated, of those points in the character of Becket which have been so differently represented by every biographer from old Fox to Mr. Froude.

Here let us pause for a moment to notice Mr. Churton's work, one of those earnest little books with which the "Englishman's Library" abounds, and which, from their deservedly large circulation; their vast and increasing influence; their good, honest, and unflinching principles; their general accuracy; pleasant, readable style, and usefully reasonable price; are daily extending their influence among the sensible middle class of this country. When we consider the high character of the contributors to this "Library," the learning and research which the majority of them have brought to bear on their different tasks, we do most sincerely regret to notice this contribution of Mr. Churton's with severity. But when we remember the class of readers for whom the work is professedly designed, we feel bound to retract, as far as this one volume is concerned, our previous commendations of accuracy. With his account of Becket alone we are now concerned, and therefore refrain from enquiring whether or not he has used his authorities in the remainder of his history discreetly and carefully. But besides his errors as to the facts of the contest—having worked himself into a crusade against Southey's "Book of the Church"—he has, in endeavouring to convict that very careful and very accurate author of a gross misstatement, proved his own carelessness, accidental we must hope, and added one more confirmatory

witness to the general accuracy of the doctor. That so gross an error, as Mr. Churton would wish his readers to believe he has discovered in the "Book of the Church," should have remained undiscovered so long, and passed over without a word of rebuke by all the many opponents of that able work, led us to doubt the correctness of Mr. Churton's assertion, previous to any investigation of the mooted point; little, however, did we suppose that the error, the misstatement, and the confusion of the Rector of Crayke was so palpable, so unwarrantable, as on enquiry we discovered, and as our readers will perceive it to be, when they arrive at that part of our sketch where the now for the first time disputed point naturally arises.

When, toward the end of the reign of William Rufus, Robert of Normandy exchanged his possessions in Europe for the laurels that might be reaped on the plains of Palestine, many of our countrymen were induced to follow his banner; among them, Gilbert Becket, a citizen of London, "who had lived quietly and contentedly among his fellows, and was not of the lowest among them." * Thus tempted to embark for the Holy Land, after many perils he fell into captivity, and having during his imprisonment converted the daughter of his Saracen captor to the faith of Christ, escaped by her means to his native land. His liberatrix most probably was the companion of his flight; but be it as it may, she arrived in England, was baptized with great ceremony, and shortly after married to her fellow fugitive. Of this romantic pair came Thomas à Becket, attended at his birth, as his cotemporaries recount, with signs and wonders, miracles and prognostications. † The education of the future chancellor was commenced in the religious house of Merton, under the direction of his father's friend, the Prior Robert, and continued, until the death of his mother, in the schools of the metropolis. After that he went to Oxford, and eventually to Paris. On his return from the latter, his father, then ex-sheriff of London, obtained the situation of clerk in the office of his successor for his son. Archdeacon Baldwin, and his brother Eustace, who at that time resided in the house of Becket, pleased with the diligence and ability of the young clerk, pre-

---

* Epist. i. 108.

† Born A.D. 1118, where Mercer's chapel was afterwards erected, according to Fuller.—*Worthies of England, p.* 203.

"Beatus Thomas, natus est in legitimo matrimonio, et honestis parentibus, patre Gileberto, qui et vice comes aliquando fuit."—*Fitzstephen; MS. Lamb., fol.* 1 *a.*

sented him to the notice of Archbishop Theobald. * Once introduced into the palace of his predecessor in the see of Canterbury, his urbane and politic manners, his talent for the study of the civil law, his aptness for diplomacy, obtained for him foreign missions, during which he perfected himself in his civil law studies, under the most celebrated doctors of Boulogne and Auxerre, gained great popularity, and laid the foundation of his future preferments. On his return from abroad, although only in deacon's orders, he was promoted, by Theobald, to the archdeaconry of Canterbury, and presented to the incumbencies of Saint Mary-le-Strand, and Otteford, in Kent.

It was at this time that the gradual encroachments of the ecclesiastical on the civil power, mainly fostered by the troubles during the reign of the usurper Stephen, rendered it necessary that the State should re-assert its power. The excesses of the inferior body of the clergy had now become too frequent and alarming to be passed over by so politic a king as Henry; whilst the now established claim of exemption from all secular jurisdiction on the part of the clergy, and the weakness of the ecclesiastical punishments which the ordinaries chose to inflict on their criminal brethren, imperatively required that the privileges of the clergy should be reduced within those bounds to which our Anglo-Saxon ancestors had wisely confined them. † To effect such reforms as these, it was necessary for the king to obtain the assistance of a chancellor of congenial views, firm of purpose, able in devising, uncompromising in action. He chose, therefore, Thomas à Becket; and that he erred not in his choice, the able conduct of that wonderful man was evidence. By his advice, his biographers tell us, the power of the realm was restored; the Flemish mercenaries, who were wasting the fair fields of England, were banished; the barons who strove

---

* "Subinde pereuntibus annis—adherit Theobaldo bonæ memoriæ Cantuar Archiepiscopi, per duos fratres Londinenses Baldevinum Archidiaconum et magistrum Eustachium, hospites plerumque patris ejus et familiares Archiepiscopi, introductus in ipsius notitiam."—*Fitzstephen; MS. Lamb., fol.* 1 *b.*

† The state of the clergy, even after Becket's election, may be inferred from a quotation in a letter written, in 1165, by John of Salisbury:—"My abbot salutes you, and so does the Bishop of Châlons, to whom I spoke lately about receiving one of your clerics. He acquiesces readily, but hopes you will send him some creditable person; yet he will take in whomsoever you will send. When you send him, do instil into him the necessity of a modest deportment, for the men of this country are modest."—*Froude, p.* 99.

"Plusquam centum homicidia (it was reported) intra fines Angliæ a clericis sub regno ejus commissa."—*Gul. Neub.* i. 16.

Fitzstephen; MS. Lamb., fol. 3 *a.*

to oppose all return to law and order were subdued, and their castles destroyed; merchants passed without fear of robbery from one end of England to the other; commerce revived; England was at peace within her own shores, feared and honoured abroad.

Towards his own order, Becket acted rather as a statesman than as an ecclesiastic. First, he hesitated not to impose on them a scutage for the maintenance of the war of Toulouse—an imposition which Gilbert Foliot characterized as "that sword plunged into the bowels of mother Church;" * and his patron, Theobald, on his death bed, vowed to God to prohibit, under pain of excommunication. † Secondly, when, in his presence, the supremacy of the Pope was upheld by the Bishop of Chichester, and Henry rebuked that prelate, and declared, in the hearing of all, "that the supremacy of the Pope was upheld by man alone, but that of the king by God," then we are told the new chancellor joined the king against the Pope, reminded the bishop of his oath of allegiance, and seconded, if he had not previously prompted, the rebuke of the king. ‡ And lastly, if we are to believe Matthew Paris—and we see no reason to the contrary, more especially as his assertions are confirmed by Radulphus de Diceto—the views of Becket, respecting the relative power of the Pope and the king, continued the same for some little time after his elevation to the primacy. In the great cause between the Bishop of Lincoln and the Abbot of St. Alban's, a bull had been obtained by the bishop, referring the cause to the decision of the Papal legates. Henry, however, determined to hear it in his own court, and accordingly summoned the contending parties before him. The abbot, fearful of being brought before the legates for a second hearing, demanded of the king that proof made before him should be subject to no appeal. The king admired his prudence, and commended him for it to Becket, who sat by his side. The case was heard; the privileges having been proved, judgment

---

* "Divi Thomæ," epist. i. 126; Cotton MS.

† He had vowed to God, among other things, to prohibit, under pain of excommunication, the exaction of the second aid his brother the archdeacon had imposed on the Church. (Joan Salis., epist. 49, cited by Lord Lyttleton). John of Salisbury admits (epist. 159) that Becket had allowed the measure to pass, and was therefore justly punished in being now persecuted by the very person whom he had preferred to his original benefactor.

‡ Wilkins' Concilia, i. p. 431—a passage sadly mutilated, but still sufficiently preserved to show the intentions of Becket. (See the full account of the matter in the appendix to Sir F. Palsgrave's "Constitution of England." The old chronicler there quoted fully bears out the assertion in the text).

was given in favour of the abbot, and signed, among others, by Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury. *

Towards Becket, the confidence and liberality of Henry were unbounded; he laid open his mind to his new favourite as to a brother; and, like a second Joseph, he ruled supreme over the realm. His magnificence, the pomp and splendour of his manner of living, rivalled that of his sovereign; † and the peasantry of France might well wonder how great must be the wealth, how unbounded the magnificence of the King of England, when his chancellor was attended by such a train of nobles and knights. ‡ The consent of antiquity has decided him to have been overfond of popularity, ornament, costliness of apparel, the pleasures of the table, and elaborate pomp of every kind and in every form: to the humble, courteous and kind; to the proud, haughty and passionate. ‖ Although a cleric, he led his troops out to battle, and delighted rather in the battle cry than in orisons.

Such was the man, the man after his own heart, whom Henry determined to raise to the see of Canterbury on the death of the worthy Theobald. On this step the heart of the king was set. "If I were dead (said he to his justiciary), wouldst thou not devote thy life and thy energies in favour of my son? Then cease not in thy endeavours until my chancellor is raised to the see of Canterbury." § And why was all this anxiety? Because Becket was a man after Henry's own heart—because "the king, having had manifold trial of him, deemed his magna-

---

* "Unum peto (said the abbot) quod si in audientiâ vestrâ ecclesiæ meæ libertatem declavero et evicero; ne me coarcent judices delegati, iterato litigare de evictâ libertate." Tunc Rex prudentiam ejus cum optimatibus suis admirans, ad Archiepiscopum Thomam Cantuariensem conversus dicit. "Quod dicit abbas rationi consentaneum est, neque enim nostræ majestati honorificum foret, si lis in Palatio, consistorio iterandum, præstolaretur sententiam." Amongst the signatures to the decree is that of Thomas Cantuar. (See Matt. Paris, Vitæ Sancti Abb. Albani, pp. 77 and 79; Radulphus de Diceto, sub. Ann. 1162).

† "Jamque pedem porrexit in semitas seculi, jam ad honores aspirare, effundere animum in exteriora, et vanas mundi amplitudines ambire cepit."—*Grime, fol.* 4; *MS. Arund.*

"Novus itaque erigitur super Egyptum Joseph, præficitur universis regni negociis, post regem secundus, augentur honores, prædia possessiones et divitiarum splendor, ac mundi gloria multiplicatur, sequuntur ex more immuneri mancipiorum greges, stipantur electorum catervæ militum, nec cancellario minor quam regi comitatus adhesit, ita ut non nunquam corriperetur a rege, quod regis hopitium vacuasset."—*Grime, fol.* 7.

‡ Fitzstephen, 20, 21; cited by Dr. Lingard.

‖ "Humilis humilibus elatis ferus et violens."—*Fitzstephen; MS. Lamb., fol.* 6.

§ Cited by Lord Lyttleton.

nimity and fidelity to be fit for so high a dignity; and also that he would have a care of his profit, and govern all things in the Church and the common weal to his good liking." * That such was the opinion entertained by Henry, and that this was the chief reason of his raising him to the primacy, is distinctly asserted by every cotemporary biographer.

The expectation that Becket would unhesitatingly obey the will and pleasure of the king, in matters ecclesiastical, is distinctly asserted by Grime, † and reiterated by Fitzstephen ‡ and the Lambeth biography. ‖ It is useless, then, to deny that such, at least, was the view taken by those who wrote during the continuance of, or immediately after, the conclusion of these troubles: that they were justified in their assertion, their agreement renders more than probable; that Henry was justified in holding such an opinion, the already cited cases would seem to warrant us in asserting. One of the primate's biographers has recorded a warning, from Becket to the king, of his inability to serve him and the Church at the same time. The solitariness of the authority is not our only reason for rejecting this assertion; we have been far more influenced by the improbability of one so shrewd and politic as Henry, wilfully and with his eyes open running his head into a noose like this, in a matter of such importance; and when his mind was set on the reformation of the Church, deliberately forcing the primacy on one who forewarned him of his anti-reforming notions and intentions.

And now let us consider the nature of the election, and the means used to secure the elevation of the chancellor to the primacy. Lord Lyttleton and Mr. Froude are at variance on this point. The principal authority relied on by the former was that most extraordinary document, written by Gilbert Foliot, which appears in the Cottonian MS. of Becket's letters. Now this letter cannot, with any safety, be regarded as anything better than, to use Mr. Froude's words, "a published pamphlet to

---

* "Life and Ecclesiastical History," p. 6.

† "Rex autem arbitratus cancellarium suas per omnia velle sequi voluntates, ut ante, et imperiis obtemperare, ipsi archiepiscopum dedit."—*Grime, MS. Arund., fol.* 7 *a.*

‡ "Statuit Rex Anglice cancellarium suum in archiepiscopatum promovere, intentu meritorum personæ, et confidens quod se ad placitum et nutum, ut cancellarius fecerat, archiepiscopus obsequeretur."—*Fitzstephen; MS. Lamb. fol.* 8 *b*, 9 *a.*

‖ "Iterum Archiepiscopo Theobaldo rebus humanis exempto, deferendi locum honoris suo dilecto Rex se nactum esse gavisus est; in multis enim expertus magnanimitatem ejus et fidem, tanto quidem fastigio bene sufficiente credit, scilicet ad suas utilitates facile semper inclinandum."—*MS. Lamb. A., fol.* 2 *b.*

vindicate his (Foliot's) conduct in the eyes of his own generation and posterity—an *ex parte* statement." Consequently, any facts very much in favour of Foliot and against his opponent, which either stand entirely unsupported by cotemporary authority, or contradict the united testimony of the writers of the age, must be rejected; therefore we entirely reject his account of Becket's conduct at Clarendon. Such facts, however, as are borne out by and are consistent with cotemporary authorities, may safely be used with proportionable discount. And therefore, when we find Foliot, in this letter, asserting that personal threats were uttered against him for his opposition to Becket's election, that exile and personal suffering were threatened,* we may safely assume, according to Becket's own words, "that he did not ascend into the fold of Christ by the true way, not having been called by canonical election, but obtruded into it *by the terror of the secular power.*" Grime tells us that the matter was deferred, "donec a conventu extorqueret consensum;"† and that in the meeting at London, to confirm the appointment, Gilbert Foliot, though alone, still objected. The author of the Lambeth MS. (A), speaks of the election having been secured rather by the *instantia regis*, than the votes of the clergy ‡ and the people. And lastly, William of Newborough—Mr. Berington's highly estimable historian—speaks of the primacy as "minus sincere et canonice id est per operam manumque regiam susceptum;" and of Becket's rendering his insignia of office into the Pope's hands, on account of the informality of his election. ‖ Be it as it may, on the 2nd of June, 1162, Becket was ordained priest, and on the day following consecrated archbishop. The form of the election might have been correct; the reason of it cannot be doubted of.

Until very lately we have been accustomed to take it for granted, that on his elevation to the primacy the ostentatious parade and worldly pursuits of the chancellor were forthwith renounced by the archbishop, and that, in the fervour of his conversion, Becket

---

* "Quod loquimur experto novimus.....verbum proscriptionis ilico audivimus et exilio crudeliter addicti sumus."—*Cott. MS., Claud., b.* ii., *let.* 126, *lib.* i.

† "Si aliquamdiu differtur negocium donec a conventu extorqueret consensum, qui liberam ab antiquo solet habere vocem in electione pontificis."—*Grime, fol.* 6 *b.*

‡ "Unde totis enitems viribus, non prius destitit quam apud Angliæ clerum optimum, cum in archiepiscopatum subrogavit. Non nullis tamen, idcirco promotionem ejus visum est minus canonicum, quod ad eam magis operata est regis instantia quam cleri vel populi vota."—*MS. Lamb. A., fol.* 2 *b.*

‖ "Secundo promotionis anno, concilio Turonensi interfuit, ubi (ut dicitur) pontificatum, &c. Pungentis conscientiæ stimulos non ferens, secreto in manus Domini Papæ resignavit."—*Gul. Neub.* 1, 16, *p.* 169. *Ed. par.* 1510.

prescribed for himself, as a punishment for the luxury and vanity of his former life, a daily course of secret mortification. This sudden change—so sudden, in the words of one of his biographers, "Ut omnes mirarentur"—having been admitted on all sides, has been variously interpreted by the opponents and panegyrists of the primate—the one party regarding it as a proof of his hypocrisy, the other as a clear and undoubted manifestation of his sanctity: the reason of the change was the only point in dispute. Mr. Froude, however, has taken up an entirely new view of the case; he has denied the existence of the point in dispute—the sudden change of habits. In opposition to the universal consent of every biographer of Becket, from Grime to Dr. Lingard, and every cotemporary chronicler, he has, on the authority of three detached passages, drawn together from the entire body of the epistles, asserted that, so far from Becket's changing his ways of life, his continued luxuriousness became subject of regret to his friends, and of accusations against him to his enemies.*

Let us consider this point.

Mr. Froude's witnesses are three in number—two remonstrances from friends, and one accusation by an enemy—which, if taken in the sense Mr. Froude would put on them, would go far to establish the charge of hypocrisy, or at least to prove that the new archbishop was very far from a fit person for his situation. To these are to be opposed the universal consent of his cotemporaries, who one and all bear testimony to a sudden and wondrous change, from elaborate pomp and luxurious elegance to a most rigorous and penitential discipline, from feasting to abstinence, from revellings to prayer, from luxurious repose to harassing watchings. Can it be possible that one and all of his cotemporaries should have been so ignorant of the public life of the primate as not to have known the manner of his living, or the nature of his associates? Or are we warranted in assuming that they, one and all, combined, with a wondrous harmony, in recording a gross falsehood, and that too at a time when so many eye-witnesses of his life and conduct must have been living? Unwilling and unjustified in acceding to either of these views, we must carefully examine these three

* The passage from Grime will be sufficient:—"Celebrata autem ordinatione, et singulis in sua reversis, venerabilis quoque archiepiscopus mox in seipsum reversus est, et ad Dominum totus est conversus. Ex integro, etsi non habitum, illico animum immutavit—onere et jugo, carnis insolentiam enervare diversis penitentiæ laboribus elegit." (Fol. 7 *a*, MS. Arund.) And also towards conclusion of MS.:—"Statim veterem exuit hominem, carnem crucifigans cum vitiis et concupicenciis." This change is fully borne out by the MS. Lamb. A., fol. 8 *b*.

wonderful witnesses, which are so fatal to the consent of antiquity.

Now these witnesses are in number three—three quotations from letters written in the second year after his consecration, the year in which he fled from England. The first—which is to prove, "that after his advancement, as before, his studies were remarkable for their political and philosophical, rather than their religious character," (Froude, p. 2)—is from John of Salisbury, some time in the spring of the year 1165; and it proves, what few would dispute, that Becket had not yet lost his relish for the study of the civil law, but that, in the opinion of his friend, the psalms and the sermons of Gregory were more proper objects for his study than the philosophy of the schools. Had this letter referred to the time of his consecration, and been taken in its strictest sense, we do not see how it would have invalidated the previous testimony; but when we consider that it was really written nearly two years after his elevation to the primacy, we grant Mr. Froude the most enlarged sense of this letter, and still remain in our former opinion. The next epistolary witness is a letter from John, Bishop of Poictiers, written some few months after, when Becket was living at the monastery of Pouligni. This is to prove, that "after his advancement, as before, his dress and retinue were remarkable for their magnificence, his table for its utmost fastidiousness," (Froude, p. 2). His lordship of Poictiers, knowing that money is the sinew of war, first advises his lordship of Canterbury to accept a pension from the King of France, and thus to keep his own funds unimpaired; and then, beginning to doubt of the prospects of this pension being paid, recommends his friend to "husband his resources in every possible way," that his enemies may see that he is prepared for every suffering his exile may reduce him to. He then recommends him "to get rid of his superfluous incumbrances," and to consider the badness of the times, which promises him neither a speedy nor an easy return. And lastly, in furtherance of this idea of husbanding his resources, and in consideration of the narrow accommodation afforded him by the Cistercian convent—"Your wisdom (says his lordship) ought to know that no one will think less of you, if, in conformity to your circumstances, and in condescension to the religious house that entertains you, you content yourself with a moderate establishment of horses and men, such as your necessities require." And further than this the deponent saith not.

And what does all this witness amount to? First, advice to live on his friends, and save his own money; secondly, retrench

all expenses not required by an exile and the visitor at a Cistercian convent; and lastly, now that you no longer draw the revenues of your see, be careful, be prudent, and do not even keep up that establishment which you did when in England, for that which, in comparison to the magnificence of your *menage* when chancellor, was considered mean as archbishop, is still too much for your present contracted revenues, and hardly fair on your entertainers. Supposing, with Mr. Froude, that after his consecration Becket was as magnificent in his retinue as luxurious in his table, as an archbishop should be, can we believe that he ever would have attempted to have continued such a style of living when an exile and almost pennyless guest of a Cistercian convent? Had such been the case, it would not have been *one* of his friends who would have remonstrated with him on his folly, but *one and all.* How much more reasonable, therefore, is it to suppose that even his moderate retinue, his frugal table, was considered by *one* of his friends as too great a drain upon his humble resources, too great a burthen on his poor but friendly entertainers.

And now we come to the third witness, who is to prove, that "after his advancement, as before, his companions were remarkable for their rank and intellectual accomplishments;" but which, if taken in Mr. Froude's way (*i. e.*, without its contradiction, given by the same letter), would at once overthrow the character of the primate, and prove him to be a perfect disgrace to the hierarchy. After noticing a visit paid by Becket's most violent opponent, John of Oxford, to the Empress Matilda, and the stories he had told her about the primate and his party, Nicholas of Rouen continues:—

"They say, too, that it is plain God cannot be on your side, for that, from the first day you were archbishop, you have had about you, not persons remarkable for their religion, but for their intellectual rank, whom they call by a coarse name, which it is useless to repeat. They also assert, that in disposing of your benefices you have looked to your own service more than God's, and have promoted men of notoriously lax character."

Now who can help seeing that this accusation, if true—and unless true, where is Mr. Froude's deduction?—means much more than Mr. Froude has been pleased to deduce from it? When, however, the consent of all cotemporaries besides is considered, who will not agree with Nicholas in setting these accusations down as "*base fabrications,*" which he tells his friend he had mentioned "*as well to put him on his guard as to account for the anger of the empress.*" If any one is content on such authority as these three passages, to reject the unanimous consent of cotemporary authorities, we hope he may

always find as harmless an opportunity of indulging his love of change and novelty.

And now pass we on to the all wondrous topic of the hair shirt and its inhabitants—a topic we are almost afraid of venturing on in so slight a paper as this, when we consider that Mr. Froude, with all his learning and all his acuteness, has been able to cast a doubt only over the adequacy of the proof of its disgusting appendages, though he did venture to deny that it was ostentatiously displayed. The state of the case seems this, according to Fitzstephen: when, after the murder, the dead body of the primate was laid out, the confessor of Becket discovered to the monks the existence of the habit of their order beneath the archiepiscopal robes, and of a shirt of hair beneath the monastic habit—a fact, according to that writer, not as yet known to any but the confessor. With a knowledge of this fact, he stated, in another part of his biography, that from the time of his consecration he wore a shirt of hair next his body, which was quite consistent with the discovery; but he further added, that it was "verminibus scaturiens." This, being an addition to his relation of the discovery, is doubted by Mr. Froude. Grime, however—quite as good an authority as Fitzstephen in all points, and, as far as any relating to the latter scenes of the primate's life, much more likely to be accurate—gives a very different, but more probable account of the matter. When they came to unrobe the murdered primate, previous to the burial lavation, they discovered that beneath his habit of a canon he had worn that of a monk, with such secrecy as to escape the knowledge of his familiar companions. Next to his skin they found a garment of hair so crammed with vermin, that some might think his yesterday's martyrdom less severe than that which he must have suffered from his minute tormentors. Here we have no mention of a doubt about the existence of the hairy garment, but only of the monastic habit.* And, as far as the pedicular inhabi-

* "Prius tamen ut moris est, corpus mundissimum martyris lavandum expoliantes sub habitu canonici regularis eum in habitu et ordine monachorum tam secreto diu reperiunt extitisse, ut etiam hoc suos lateret familiares. Ad ultimum carni proximum inveniunt cilicum sic bestiunculo obsitum ut levius iste pristinæ diei fuisse martyrium quivis judicaret, et hostes majores, minoribus minus nocuisse." (Fol. 42, Arund. M. S.) The remainder of Grime's description is too disgusting to be quoted.

It will not be thought irrelevant to add a few extracts from the service appointed by the Roman Church for the day of St. Thomas à Becket, to show the view entertained by that Church respecting this point:—

"Thomas, being raised to the highest priesthood,
Is suddenly changed into another man:
A monk under the garb of a clerk clothed with hair-cloth:
More strong than the flesh subdues the attempts of the flesh."
Hymn before First Lesson.

"For when consecrated he is suddenly changed into another man: he secretly

tants are concerned, the venerable primate becomes a second Strepsiades, and with him might have cried :—

——"ἐκ τοῦν δέρματος
δακνουσί μ' ἐξέρποντες——
Καὶ τὰς πλευρὰς δαρδάπτουσι
Καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐκπίνουσι
Καὶ μ' ἀπολοῦσι."—*Clouds*, l. 684.

The change that took place in Becket may have been, and most probably was, such as was natural to every great mind under the impression of a high sense of duty. It may have been sincere; but if so, unfortunately for Becket, it bore the fewest possible marks of its real nature.

Ere a month had elapsed, Henry had ample proof of the alteration which had taken place in the feelings of his former associate. In a manner barely respectful, Becket requested the king to provide himself with a new chancellor, as he could not attend to the duties of chancellor and primate. Henry, with similar kindness, relieved the over-worked prelate from the labours of his archdeaconry and incumbencies. Such were the initiatory skirmishes in the great contest between the king and the Pope. In the second year of his primacy, Becket went to the council at Tours, and there, if we may believe William of Newborough, resigned his pontificate into the hands of the Pope. "Qui factum approbans, pastoralem illi sarcinam ecclesiasticam manu rursus imposuit et in homine scrupuloso turbatæ conscientiæ lœsionem sanavit." Shortly after the return of the archbishop from this council, the first claim against the king was advanced on the part of Becket. "Among many other claims (says Gervase), he demanded of the king the custody of the castles of Rochester, Saltwode, and Hethe, as appertaining to the see of Canterbury."* He claimed also the homage of the Earl of Clare for the castle of Tonbridge, and the land of William de Ros. "There is little doubt (says one of Becket's modern defenders) but that these claims were just." It is a curious fact, when coupled with this assertion, that most, if not all, of his cotemporary biographers have neglected the first two

put on the hair-shirt, and wore also hair-drawers down to the knee. And under the respectable appearance of the clerical garb, concealing the monk's dress, he entirely compelled the flesh to obey the spirit."—*First Lesson.*

These extracts could be trebled if required. (See Tyler's "Primitive Christian Worship," part ii., cap. 1.)

* "Repetebat ab ipso rege custodiam castelli Rossensis et turris Saltwode et Hethe, et ad dominium suæ sedis peculiariter pertinere dicebat. De comite Clarensi homagium castelli de Tunebregge cum adjacenti leacà petebat; terram quoque Willelmi de Ros, et alia hujusmodi quam plurima."—*Chron. Gerv. Col.* 1388.

claims, passed them over without note or comment, and rested their entire defence of the primate on that against Roger Earl of Clare, thus showing their opinion as to which was the strongest point that could be made in Becket's favour. To this may be added the declared opinion of one of no mean authority, Radulphus de Diceto, that the claim on William de Ros was illegal. Our information is now so meagre that we are unable to form any decision as to the claims of Saltwode and Hethe; but this we do know, that if Becket claimed no more than the constableship and custody of the tower of Rochester, the king acted most illegally in his resistance, as the grant by Henry I. could not be set aside. Moreover, the homage of the holder of the castle of Tonbridge had undoubtedly been alienated from the see of Canterbury; but that alienation had been effected, for a valuable consideration, by the Conqueror, and with the consent of the then possessor of the primacy.* As to the last of these claims, the works of Becket's cotemporaries prove, that by a general inquisition it had been found that the land of William de Ros was granted to him by feoffment from Henry I.; alienated from him and given to the see of Canterbury by the usurper Stephen; and that inasmuch as the alienation of an usurper could not overrule the grant of his rightful predecessor, William de Ros still held his lands of the king.† There can be little doubt but that some of these claims were unjust.

The next point of dispute was Becket's refusal to appoint the king's nominee to the vacant archdeaconry of Canterbury. Such a demand the king had no right to make, and Becket was clearly justified in refusing to exercise his patronage according to this "instantissimam regis postulationem."‡ But, justified as the primate was in this particular act, nothing could be more unjustifiable than his conduct respecting the patronage of the church of Eynesford, as well before as after the excommunication of the regal patron. William, lord of the manor and patron of the living of Eynesford, had given the advowson to the convent of Christ Church, in Canterbury; on a vacancy, Becket claimed the right of presenting to this living, as belonging to one of his military tenants, and denied the right of the real patron to give away the advowson to the convent: he accordingly presented one Lawrence, who being shortly after forcibly ejected

* Hearnes, lib. Niger Scacc, p. 66; Matt. Paris, Vita S. Thom., p. 78; Epist. S. Thom., lib. iii. 65.

† "Inquisitio generalis est facta per Angliam, cui quis in servicio seculari de jure teneretur obnoxius: inventum est autem in Cantia, procurantibus justiciariis, quod Willelmus de Ros, in munere quolibet subeundo, regem deberet agnoscere, non Thomam Archiepiscopum."—*Chron. Gerv. Col.* 1384.

‡ Stephanides, p. 28; Diceto, 536.

by the followers of the lord of the manor, Becket forthwith excommunicated the lord himself. Up to this point the conduct of Becket was quite bad enough; we shall see how it improved.

This knight, besides being a military tenant of the archbishop's for the manor in question, held lands of the crown, and had the privileges of the king's military tenants, whom the clergy were, by the laws of the Conqueror, restrained from excommunicating without the leave of their sovereign lord. Of this fact Becket might not have been aware at the time of his fulminating his sentence: however, the king immediately laid his commands on Becket to absolve his tenant; the primate returned for answer, that it was not the duty of the king to prescribe to him whom he should absolve or whom he should excommunicate.* Had Becket but looked at the law as it then stood, he would have seen how far the king was right. According to the law, had William of Eynesford been wrong in his evicting the nominee of the primate, still he was in no way liable to the sentence of excommunication without the leave of the king.† How much greater, therefore, was the wrong, when we find that his right of gift as to the advowson was thus distinctly recognised by Becket's successor, Richard, who restored the advowson to the monks, on its being admitted that William of Eynesford had given it to the convent of Canterbury.‡ The quarrel between the king and the primate became bitterly personal, and in the end the latter yielded as to the excommunication; but did not restore the patronage to his monks, as we gather from the honest conduct of his successor. Thus much about this unjust claim, illegal act, and, for the time, successful encroachment of the archbishop.

The chapter of Mr. Churton's work, in which the times of Becket are treated of, seems to claim more than ordinary credit for accuracy and fairness. The old quotation from *Othello*—

> "I pray you,
> When you shall these unlucky deeds relate,
> Speak of me as I am; nothing extenuate,
> Nor aught set down in malice;"

---

* "Rex statim archiepiscopo scripsit, ut eum absolveret, respondit archiepiscopus, non esse regis præcipere quemquam absolvi sicut nec excommunicari."—*Fitzstephen; Lamb. MS., fol.* x. 6.

† See Eadmer, p. 6:—"Nisi ejus precepto implacitaret, aut excommunicaret, aut ulla ecclesiastici rigoris pena constringerat."

‡ "Ricardus Archiepiscopus Ecclesiam de Eynesford, quam in audientiâ multorum confessus est, quod Willelmus dominus ejusdem fundi dederet conventui Cantuariensi eisdem restituif. Ezenia quoque (continues Gervase) reddidit conventui, quæ de quibusdam villis monachorum solebat *sed injuste* archiepiscopi deferri."—*Gervase Act Pontif. Cantuar. Col.* 1675.

stands prominent on the page, and the facts of the dispute are ushered in with a declaration, that though "shortly stated, the reader may depend upon their being stated as they are found." Mr. Churton then proceeds to state some of the encroachments made by the Conqueror on the Saxon Parliaments, and gravely informs his readers, that "there was only one of the institutions of the country which the Conqueror left free from these encroachments—this was the Church, which was still to be governed by its own laws, as it had been in Saxon times;" for which sentence we would read—there was only one of the institutions of the country which the Conqueror encouraged in its encroachments, and that was the Church, which was henceforth to be governed by its own laws, administered by its own judges, as it had *not* been in Saxon times, when it was dependant on the common law of the land.* The separation of the ecclesiastical from the civil court, we are told, was intended to diminish the power of the Church; though it had, as was to be expected, the contrary effect. We can hardly suppose that William was so little acquainted not only with the natural disposition of the Churchmen of those days, but also of mankind in general, as to think of decreasing the Church's power, by erecting them into a separate self-judging tribunal, the originators, the claimants, and the judges of their own rights and privileges. Mr. Churton admits that the king did regard Becket, and justly so, as one of his own way of thinking, as to Church matters, and that "immediately on becoming archbishop he changed his dress and habit from that of a lawyer's robes to a prelate's mitre and cope, and made it visible to all that his mind was equally changed." The majority of the initiatory quarrels are passed over unnoticed, and the early conduct of the prelate entirely omitted by Mr. Churton; and as for Mr. Froude, the quarrel about the advowson of Eynesford is alone alluded to.

Having now cleared the way up to the year 1164, let us pass at once to the consideration of the great contest—the dispute at Clarendon. As a proof of the power of condensation possessed

---

* Before the conquest the bishop and the earl sat together in the court of the county or hundred; and common, not canon law, was administered. William granted, ut nullus episcopus vel archidiaconus de legibus episcopalibus amplius in hundret placita teneant, nec causam quæ ad regimen animarum pertinet, ad judicium sæcularium hominum adducant. (Wilkins Leg. Anglo Saxon, 230). This grant is too indefinite to be clearly defined in its extent; advantage, however, was taken of it. But it is also deducible, that the clergy mistrusted their power, from the careful definition in the coronation oath of Stephen. Ecclesiasticarum personarum et omnium clericorum, et rerum eorum justitiam et potestatem, et distributionem honorum ecclesiasticorum, in manu episcoporum esse, *perhibeo et confirmo.*) Wilk. Leg. Anglo Sax., 310).

by Mr. Churton, we will quote his account of this memorable meeting:—

"But now came the great contest. Henry called together a council of the realm—it is incorrect to call this a Parliament, as many writers do—consisting of two archbishops, twelve of the bishops, and thirty-nine lay barons, at Clarendon, near Salisbury, on the 25th of January, 1164. Here he laid before them some laws, which he called the customs of England, for bringing all the Church laws under the control of the King's hall, and making the courts of the archbishop and other bishops all to be liable to an appeal to the king's chief justice; in other words, to make the whole government of the Church depend upon what the king, with the council of State, should determine to be law."

Now, from this account, any one not well acquainted with the facts of the case would naturally suppose that the king did at this council, perhaps packed for the occasion, suddenly call on his clergy to sign and obey a set of laws, of which they then heard for the first time. Such was not the view of the case taken by Becket himself and his cotemporaries.

The very occasion of this unhappy contest, say the clergy of England to the Pope, was an anxious wish on the part of the king to enforce equal justice among his subjects. Certainly the clergy had been convicted of extravagant abuses, and his majesty, in seeking redress in the ecclesiastical courts, was unable to procure any sentence against them beyond degradation from holy orders.* William of Newborough, too, whose tract, "De Rebus Anglicis," the Roman Catholic writer, Mr. Berington, tells us is rendered "highly estimable by extensive knowledge of the subject, veracity of narration, and proper arrangement," states, that it was intimated to the king that many crimes were frequently committed by clergymen against the public discipline, and in despite of the law of the land. In the king's own hearing, it was declared that above an hundred homicides had been committed by the clergy in England under his reign. Much disturbed at this, in a vehement spirit, the king put forward some edicts against clerical malefactors, which were frustrated by the conduct of the bishops,† who, more watchful in the defence of the liberties and dignities of the clergy than in the correction of their

---

* Froude, 177.

† "Nempe episcopi, dum defendendis magis clericorum libertatibus vel dignitatibus quam eorum vitiis corrigendis resecandis que invigilant: arbitrantur obsequium se præstare Deo et ecclesiæ si facinorosos clericos, quos pro officii debito, canonicæ vigore censuræ coercere nolunt vel negligunt: contra publicam tuentur disciplinam. Unde, clerici—habentes per impunitatem agendi quodcunque libuerit: neque—Deum, neque homines potestatem habentes reverentur."—*Guliebmus Neubrigensis de Rebus Anglicis, lib.* ii., *c.* 16.

vices, considered it their bounden duty, towards God and the Church, to screen from public punishment those guilty ones of their clergy whom they either were unwilling or neglected to punish with such a measure of canonical censure as befitted their crimes. The consequence was, that these clergy, thus having an impunity of action, feared neither God nor man.

These complaints seem to have gone on for some time. At length, the case of a clerk of Worcestershire, who, to gratify his lust with impunity, had first murdered the father of his victim, brought the king and Becket in direct collision. Becket refused the murderer when demanded by the king, and handed him over to his bishop, for safe custody and perpetual imprisonment.* Enraged at this refusal, and "hearing (as Becket's biographer, Heribert, says) that by castigations of this sort the crimes of such clergymen, or, more truly, tonsured demons, were not repressed, but daily grew worse;"† the king required of his clergy jurisdiction over clerics: this request was made at Westminster, and there refused by all, save one: and when he further required that they should faithfully observe the customs of the land, they pleaded their order. The king gave way to his temper, and broke up the council in anger.

It is a curious fact that Henry I. declared the Church *to be free*, leaving the term unexplained. Stephen confirmed that grant, and also "all its liberties, privileges, and ancient customs, together with its lands and possessions;" and committed to the bishops "all power and jurisdiction over the persons and property of ecclesiastics." Henry II. carefully passes over the grants of Stephen, and merely confirms the grant of Henry. Unless, therefore, the word "liberam" included the disputed right, the king's demand was not only justifiable, but also strictly legal.

Immediately after the breaking up of the council several of the bishops began to change their opinions, and endeavoured, by every means in their power, to bring over the primate. Becket remained firm, until a missionary from Pope Alexander brought him letters, bidding him consent to the wishes of the king, and be at peace once more. The Pope's commands effected that which no terms or persuasions could: Becket promised that he would keep the ancient customs of the realm; trusting that he should henceforth hear no more about his pro-

* Stephan, p. 33. Grime (fol. 10) admits the charge of homicide against William de Broc.

† In speaking of the clergy it should be remembered that every person who received the tonsure, and was but once married, claimed to be exempt as a cleric. (Hallam M. Ages, cap. vii., vol. ii., p. 309.; Heribert, cap. xxii.)

mise. Henry, however, was not yet satisfied, and was determined not to relax his efforts until he had the signature of the primate and his clergy actually affixed to the customs. He was determined that the private promise which he had received from the archbishop, either at Oxford or Woodstock, should be renewed and confirmed in open Parliament. The issue of the contest might have been more favourable had Henry been less mistrustful of his old friend; as we gather from one of the letters that the signature was even more obnoxious than the constitutions themselves.*

On the 30th of January, 1164, the Parliament† met at Clarendon, and Henry called upon his clergy to give their public acquiescence to the customs: they all obeyed save Becket, who peremptorily refused. The rage of the king grew nearly to madness; there seemed no bounds to his fury. The clergy besought their primate to yield, and failed; at last, two knight templars succeeded in their entreaties: and Becket, says a friendly biographer,

"Moved rather with commiseration on the clergy than on himself, consented, by persuasion of their counsel, to submit himself to the king's pleasure; and therefore, before all the rest, the archbishop bound himself in the prescribed form; that is to say, he would observe the customs of the crown in good faith, suppressing those words, the prerogative of his order; adding also this caution with an oath, that he promised to perform this in the word of truth, so heaping sin on sin."‡

The king then demanded of him that he should command his bishops also to assent. "Concedo ait, nec mora, in medium assensere omnes." "To prevent any future question (said Henry), let the laws and customs of my grandfather Henry be openly read, and, when reduced to writing, signed by us all."§ On this the royal commissioners retired, to reduce these customs to writing. On the retirement of the commission, Becket again

* Grime, fol. 10, 11, 12.

† It will be seen that we have retained the term Parliament, contrary to Mr. Churton's dictum; and this we have done, because, first, the consent of every ancient and modern historian is against him and for us. Secondly, because Matthew Paris reckons as present archiepiscopi, episcopi abbates, priores, clerus cum comitibus baronibus et proceribus cunctis. Thirdly, because we find, in the preamble to the constitutions: "Facta est ista recognitio coram archiepiscopis, episcopis, prioribus, abbatibus, cleris, comitibus, baronibus et proceribus cunctis;" and also these words, "Easdem consuetudines recognitas per archiepiscopos, episcopos, priores, abbates, cleros, comites barones et per nobiliores et antiquiores regni." And lastly, because the learned and accurate Selden calls it, that great Parliament.

‡ Life and Eccles. History, p. 8, Grime, fol. 14:—"Inquit cedo consiliis regis et anno voluntate. Et spopondit cunctis audientibus quod in fide bonâ servaret leges et consuetudines regni."

§ Grime, fol. 14.

began to object, to throw impediments in the way; he said, "he was no sage, he knew not what the customs were." Yes, he, the once learned and able chancellor, had been so incurious of the common law, as to be ignorant of the customs of the realm. Was not such an evasion too weak to impose even on himself? However, he obtained what he most wanted—delay. On the next day the customs were produced to Parliament, and the attendant prelates and nobles required to affix their seals, that the record might be authenticated. Becket refused; he declared, that although he had promised to observe them, yet he had never promised to confirm them. Thus having morally perjured himself, and by that perjury obtained delay, he departed from the Parliament "vexed, ashamed, and disappointed." Thus was the scabbard thrown away on both sides. Whether or not Becket did eventually subscribe "*the constitutions*," as they are called, we have no direct evidence. The otherwise unintelligible conduct of the king at Northampton would seem to warrant the conclusion that his signature was obtained, though perhaps after much delay. Grime, however, informs us, that on the entreaties of the Bishop of Evreux (who had come from beyond sea in order to effect a reconciliation between Becket and Henry), he actually wrote to the Pope requesting his confirmation of the obnoxious constitutions.* The Pope, however, conceiving that this act had been forced on the primate, instead of confirming, forthwith condemned them. These constitutions of Clarendon—an account of which we have subjoined in a note†—"entirely changed the legal and civil state of the clergy, and were an actual subversion, as far as they went, of the Papal policy so boldly introduced by Gregory the Seventh." Such is the opinion of Mr. Sharon Turner—an opinion, in all points, of weight, and more especially in this one, as it has been cited by

* Grime fol. 15:—"Instante episcopo per eundem Scripsit sanctus Archiepiscopus Domino Papæ ut sua dignaretur auctoritate et sigilli impressione regias traditiones confirmare."

† They were established at Clarendon, near Salisbury, and are in number sixteen. Their object is to preserve the rights of the crown, (2, 14). To prevent appeals from being made to any foreign court, (4, 8). To restrain the carrying of causes into ecclesiastical courts (1, 15.), and the exercise of an undue (5) or inquisitorial power (6) in those courts, while their just rights were preserved by the aid of temporal authority, (10, 13). To regulate ecclesiastical elections, so that the appointment might not fall into the hands of the Pope, (12). To subject ecclesiastical property to civil service (11), and Churchmen to the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts of law, so far that it might be known what cognizance was claimed by the ecclesiastical power, and how the offending parties were punished, (3, 9). To screen persons connected with the king from the immediate effect of ecclesiastical censures (7); and to prevent the ordination of slaves, unless with the consent of their masters, (16). (See "Johnson's Councils," and note to pages 57 and 58 of Mr. V. Short's "History of the Church").

Mr. Butler against Dr. Southey, and made, by dint of suppression and insertion, to appear on the side of Becket and his party.* "These new constitutions (continues Mr. Turner) abolished that independence on the legal enactments of the country which William had unwisely permitted; and again subjected the clergy, *as in the time of the Anglo Saxons, to the common law of the land;*" not, as Mr. Churton asserts, "to the king's arbitrary will."

Up to this point of the contest the primate's conduct had been as bad as the king's was good. Allowing, for argument's sake, that the customs were no customs, an infringement of the liberty of the Church, tyrannical, contrary to law; that the reasons for their adoption, however plausible, were founded on separate cases raked together for the purpose, and without sufficient enquiry; still the conduct of Becket, in attempting to shelter his real purpose under the mask of casuistry, is nothing less than perjury.

Again, if we look on these constitutions as wise, just, and necessary, and the old law of the land—and that they were such who can for a moment hesitate to believe, when, throughout the entire mass of the Becket letters, there is not one attempt to show that the constitutions were not the ancient usages and laws of the realm, but only that they were contrary to canon law, the decrees of Popes and of foreign councils—yet, when we consider how diametrically they were opposed to the then practice of the Church and its independence, save on the Pope, we might conscientiously praise one of the clergy of that day in his resistance to the enacting of them, had that resistance been consistent and honest, without shadow of turning or attempt at quibbling. But to accept a high civil office for the purpose of furthering such views as were but expressed in the constitutions—to demonstrate his adherence to such opinions by act and word—to accept the primacy with a knowledge of the king's opinions, and conscious that the primacy had been given for the furtherance of them—to provoke a contest—to carry on that contest with every quibble of casuistry which the creed of his Church allowed; was—we shrink from using the necessarily harsh terms against one who expiated his errors by so cruel a death. †

---

* Immediately after the words "Gregory the Seventh," Mr. Butler inserted this sentence: "And then completely introduced into the civil and ecclesiastical polity and jurisdiction of every European State," as if part of Mr. Turner's remarks. The rest of Mr. Turner's remarks he did not dare to quote. (See Turner's Hist. Engl., vol. i. 213. Butler's "Book of the Roman Catholic Church," p. 87).

† Respecting the promise, Mr. Froude says thus:—"One thing is beyond doubt, viz., that the consent he gave was subject to the approval of the Pope."

Becket now sought another audience, which the king, in the bitterness of his anger, refused. "Policy was sacrificed to feeling, and Becket made desperate." He now attempted, but without success, to escape to France, having previously sent an agent to Louis to gain for him his protection in the hour of need. * The king's indignation was at its height, and yet he dissembled so far as to receive the baffled primate, after his unsuccessful attempt at flight, with a smile and a bitter pleasantry, having already determined in his own mind to put every engine of his royal power in motion against his former friend. Becket clearly perceived that the time was come either for patient and humiliating submission, or war even to the death. He chose the latter, set the constitutions at defiance, and braved the anger of the king.

It was not very long after this memorable meeting that the great council assembled at Northampton, where a most cruel persecution was commenced against the primate. Before the assembled clergy and nobles he was charged with having refused justice to a suitor. This attack failed. The suitor had profanely substituted a book of songs for the Gospels, when required to be sworn; and the primate was justified in refusing his claim. Defeated on this point, his persecutors instituted a charge of high treason against him, for answering a previous summons of the king's by deputy. The effect of this act was to render his whole property forfeit to the crown, though always redeemable, as yet, for a very trifling fine. But, alas! in this case, anger, and not justice, was to be appeased; and a fine of five hundred pounds was exacted from the primate by a vindictive and inequitable, though strictly legal sentence. The king, in that spirit of revenge which he so oft displayed, strove to bend or break the stubborn spirit of the archbishop by frivolous, if not false suits, ruinous to his temporal possessions.

Supposing, for the sake of argument, that these demands were according to the strict letter of the law, and that no legal discharge had been obtained by Becket previous to his election to the primacy and the resignation of his civil employment; yet who can for a moment doubt that in honour and equity he was free, and that he would not have heard of one of these demands had he not provoked the irascible temper of Henry, by his conduct as well at, as also after, the Parliament at Clarendon.

Be it so; we do not find fault with Becket for refusing to observe the constitutions, after their condemnation by the Pope, but for his conduct before and during the continuation of the Parliament at Clarendon.

* Becket sent an envoy to Louis immediately after the meeting at Clarendon, according to the "Quadrilogus," and the "Chronicle" of Gervase. Anno 1164.

But though we do not agree with Mr. Froude, that on his appointment to the primacy "his accounts had been formally audited and passed"—as, in that case, many a witness must have been producible in his behalf—and that advantage was taken of his not having retained the documents of his discharge; yet we do believe, that on the very day of his election, or rather his confirmation by the bishops, he did obtain, from the accredited agents of the king, a free and open discharge from all charges of exaction of any kind, up to the time of his election to the primacy. At the council in London, one of the members (according to Grime, the Bishop of Winchester), having alluded to the power over the treasures of the king and the revenues of the country held by the chancellor, required that they should now receive the chancellor, free from every charge of exaction or misconduct of any kind. On this, the king's accredited agents, in the face of the whole assembly, proclaimed him free, ab omni calumnia et exactione. This fact depends mainly on the authority of Grime, being contradicted by Diceto; and, though worthy of mention, it would hardly warrant the broad assertion, that he received a legal and formal discharge from his former liabilities. We believe it has never been quoted as yet, and therefore we subjoin the entire extract from the manuscript.*

As each successive attack prevailed against the primate, friend after friend fell away; as the king rose in his demands, arrogant and puffed up with success, Becket became more firm and immovable; as the king lashed himself into madness, Becket became more calm: and when at the last deserted by nearly all his former friends, his prelates, and his nobles; attainted and condemned of perjury and treason; bearded by the king's knights; appealed against by his own clergy; openly reviled as a perjured traitor; but once, among this storm of threatenings and revilings—but once did he return evil for evil,

* "Wintoniensis autem presul, vir grandævus et prudens, concionem, et eos presertim quibus, rex vices suas commiserat in hoc negotio, ut quicquid faceret ratum foret: his affatus est verbis. 'Vir iste,' inquit, 'quem communi consensu eligimus in patronum, cancellarius et primus patriæ, thesauros regis et redditus regni in manu habuit, et ut diversa poscebant negocia tractavit. Verum, ne cui in posterum pateat exactioni vel calumniæ, quasi qui pro libera magis voluntate quam regni commodis dissipavit bona domini sui; *liberum eum et absolutum ab omni reclamatione suscipimus.* Incongruum enim videtur ut patrem, sibi faciat sancta ecclessia, vel patronum, qui pecuniæ probatum esse mancipium; et qui humanæ servitutis obnoxius sit necessitati.' Ad quem ministri regis. '*Ex ore*,' inquiunt, '*Regis liberum eum clamamus ab omni calumniâ et exactione nunc et in omne tempus.*'" (Grime, fol. 7 *b*; Arund. MS. See also Quadril., c. 27). It should, however, be stated that Diceto expressly denies it. ("Decem Scriptores," p. 537).

railing for railing. At this time he was indeed a martyr for conscience sake.

Finding that his utter ruin was intended, Becket retired from the council, having previously appealed to Rome; and on the day following, ere an answer could be returned to his application for leave to depart the realm, he was flying from one hiding-place to another, a fugitive in his own province. Hurried, by night, on board a fisher's boat, he crossed to Gravelines, and thence toiled, in disguise and on foot, to the abbey of St. Bertin, where he at length found rest for his wearied frame. Soon after, he went to meet the King of France at Soissons, and thence proceeded, under a French escort, to Sens, to plead his cause before the Roman court.

The Pope's conduct was weak and vacillating through the entire contest. Expelled from his own city, and dependant on the support of Louis and Henry, he hardly dared to offend either party, and therefore ran great risk of being hated and despised by both. When, immediately after Becket's flight, he was required by the king to commit the decision to delegates to be sent to England, and by the primate and Louis was pressed to summon the whole case to Rome, influenced by the fear of offending either of his powerful protectors,* he refused the applications of both parties. Louis and Becket for a time disguised their anger, hoping to obtain more favourable terms. Henry at once resented the offence. Every one who was in any way connected with the archbishop was ruthlessly driven from the realm, their goods confiscated, and they themselves left to find subsistence on the charity of foreigners. Monasteries and nunneries opened their doors to the fugitives; the King of France and Matilda of Sicily, in especial, and many nobles of both countries, contributed to their support. "This, however, could not last long; charity was fatigued, and generosity blunted, in time; and before the six years of Becket's exile had been completed, hunger and cold had done its work."†

It is impossible, within our limits, to give even an abstract of all the tortuous windings and turnings of affairs during the six years of Becket's exile; the appeals and counter appeals, commissions, suspensions, and excommunications, which were used on both sides. The policy of the king's party was delay, under the hope that the Pope might not be able to make head against Frederic and his nominee, and therefore might be induced to

* Victor died in the spring of 1164, and the accession of the new Anti-Pope, Paschal III., gave new vigour to the emperor's party.

† Froude, p. 93.

barter concessions in exchange for temporal assistance from Henry. Becket's party, on the other hand, strove to the utmost to bring matters to a conclusion. As events turned out, the policy of both parties, had it been entirely successful—the one in delaying, the other in concluding—would have been most disadvantageous to the successful party. At the beginning of the contest the Pope was so weak, that, had he immediately decided on the matter, he would rather have favoured Henry than Becket, as, being almost a fugitive, temporal aid was to be obtained at any price; and, consequently, we find that Becket's constant fear is, that "great men will be arriving at Rome with presents, against which Rome never was proof, backed not only by their own power but that of the king, whom no one in the court dared offend."* Again, in 1165, though the Pope's affairs were more satisfactory, and Rome was once more in his own hands, "money was still necessary for him—indeed, more necessary than ever; and he could not risk the loss of Peter's pence by taking up Becket's cause in the way he wished."† Again, in the year following, the first legatine commission was obtained by Henry, because, it being at that time absolutely necessary that Alexander's successes against Frederic should be followed up with energy and dispatch, "he was most anxious at this time to obtain money to carry on his war with the emperor."‡ Had Becket succeeded in obtaining a decision at any of these periods, Henry's money would have outweighed the justice of his opponent's cause. But when, through the delays made by Henry's party, the decision was put off until the Pope was firmly seated in his empire, he then dared to speak out, to threaten securely, and to enter heart and soul into the cause of Becket. An immediate decision was the proper object for Henry to have aimed at, as delay was Becket's.

The conduct of the Pope was a perfect specimen of trimming between the two parties.

In 1166 Alexander granted a legatine commission to try and settle the differences, and so constituted the commission as to leave little doubt but that the decision come to by it would be in favour of Henry. Before the commission could arrive in England —before even a preliminary step could be taken in the enquiry, he granted new letters, expressly forbidding the members of

* Epist. i. 24.

† Froude, p. 107.

‡ Mr. Froude's continuator thus goes on:—"His affairs had been some time on the advance: it seemed as if a strong effort would now end the struggle in his favour; but a strong effort could not be made without further supplies, and thus the Pope's very success was an inducement, at this time, to compromise and concession."—*Froude*, 214.

the commission from entering the dominions of Henry, or from taking any step in the matter until the archbishop was reconciled to the king; thus placing it entirely in the hands of Becket whether or not he should call the commission into action.*

In 1168, when this legatine commission had, of course, failed, and Henry was in daily fear of an interdict, and had, in consequence, endeavoured to delay the fatal day by proposing another conference, his envoys suddenly returned to him with letters from the Pope suspending the archbishop from all exercise of his spiritual powers until a reconciliation had been effected between Henry and him. This seemed decisive against Becket and his cause; it was, indeed, too straightforward and decided to last. "We (said the Pope) have laid our commands on the aforesaid archbishop, and altogether inhibit him from attempting, on any account, to put forth, either against yourself, or your land, or the nobles of your land, any sentence of interdict or excommunication, until you take him back into your favour, and he is reconciled to you, or from presuming in any matter to aggrieve you."† These letters, purchased by bribes to members of the Papal court,‡ were rendered almost nugatory by the letters written at the same time and by the same hand—those letters which he speaks of having sent to Becket; for, in those letters, the suspension, instead of being until reconciliation with Henry, was only until the following Lent.‖ With respect to his prior conduct, the Pope had hinted to Henry, "*that as to the variations which you might have discovered in our letters and our legates, this should in no wise surprise you, as we read even of the blessed Paul, that he more than once changed his purpose.*"§ Perhaps he had some equally valid authority for deliberately penning a falsehood.

Let us now pass on to that succession of conferences which succeeded the temporary suspension of the archbishop's powers,

---

* Epist. xi. 23; Froude, cap. ix. 10, and especially p. 254.

† Epist. iv. 3. The Pope to the King of England.

‡ "Would that those ounces of gold had never been (says John of Salisbury, epist. xi. 32), through which those who ought to have been the pillars of the Church were excited to its fall. So elated was the king with this his triumph, that in his own family he could not refrain from naming those cardinals who had received his pestilential gold, and those who were his agents in dispensing to some, more or less, according to the zeal they had shown in subverting justice."—*Froude, p.* 340.

‖ "Mandamus ut nec in ipsum, nec in personas regni, sententiam debeas promulgare, nisi alias nostras literas recipieres, in quibus si idem rex nollet tibi gratiam suam reddere, facultatem habeas in eum et suos officium tuum exercendi. Qua propter..... *nisi quod ei proposuerimus, usque ad initium proximæ quadragesimæ effectui mancipaverit, tibi ex tunc auctoritatem tuam restituimus.*" (Epist. iv. 16).

§ Epist. iv. 3.

and were continued over a space of two years, from that of Montmirail, in 1168, to that at Fretville, in the year 1170. Whenever, during these years, it was the policy of Rome to neglect Becket, the primate became the more anxious for the assistance and countenance of the Papal see. When, however, the Roman court took a more propitious view of the contest, Becket became comparatively careless of their assistance.

In the year 1168, an attempt was made to reconcile the contending parties. On the day of the Epiphany, Louis, Henry, and Becket, with envoys from the Pope, met at Montmirail, in obedience to the comminatory letters from Alexander; and in accordance with the counsel of Louis, and the archbishops and bishops and great men who were there, Becket, in the face of the whole assembly, on bended knees, devoted himself to "God and the king, to God's honour and the king's." After a discussion about the phrase "God's honour," Henry demanded of the primate "his promise, on the word of a presbyter and a bishop, that, without subterfuge, he would observe those usages which the holy archbishops, his predecessors, had observed for their kings, and to which he himself had on one occasion promised his consent." Becket still insisted on the salvo, "saving his order," and so the king departed without concluding a peace. Such is the account given by the envoys.* From the writers in the "Quadriloge," we learn that Henry's concessions were considered satisfactory by all present, and that Louis demanded of Becket, "whether, now that a peace was fairly offered, he meant to aim at being greater than all those holy men his predecessors." Undoubtedly he did, or he would then have acceded to those terms, and not have allowed "his † arrogance to have been the only obstacle in the way of a reconciliation." And yet, when we consider for how many years of pain and tribulation this point had been pressed upon his mind, as well by the flattery of his friends, as the opposition of his opponents—how he contended for it, amid good repute and bad repute, in prosperity and in poverty—may he not have persuaded himself that he was suffering for the benefit of his holy Church, and not hazarding its very existence, and sacrificing his own peace, his own life, for a punctilio of criticism? The issue of these proceedings is another specimen of the vacillating conduct of the Pope. Previous to the conference, letters comminatory had been sent to the archbishop, bidding him yield to the king's wish. After the conference, the envoys presented other

* Ep. iv. 8. From the Papal commissioners to the Pope, beautifully translated by Mr. Froude, p. 376.

† Quadril. p. 95.

letters, of a similar import, to the king, threatening him with severe measures unless he acquiesced in the archbishop's terms, implying even the terrors of an interdict if disobeyed. They were disobeyed; and yet, with all this "note of preparation," the powers of the Papal see slept, and Henry and his followers remained unscathed. And why? Because the King of France having just at this time deserted Becket, and thrown the weight of his influence rather on the other side, the Pope saw that it was his interest to veer round, and once more admit a conciliatory embassy—whose only object was delay—from the king of England. We well know how short-lived was Louis, desertion of his favourite; and it is curious to remark that the Pope's tenderness towards Henry and his friends was cotemporaneously brief. In a few weeks the suspension of Becket's powers was allowed to cease, in utter defiance of the time stated in the letters which Alexander sent to Henry; and consequent on this cessation was the excommunication of Henry's most faithful friend, the Bishop of London. This too serious use of this liberty frightened the Pope, who, anxious to keep well, if possible, with all parties, requested Becket to re-consider his sentence, and at least to suspend it, until the arrival of some fresh envoys, who were about to be sent on a conciliatory mission; by the means of whom, a succession of conferences took place, where much time was wasted in arguing *pro* and *con*, as to the exact meaning of the words "Salvâ regni dignitate," which Henry held out for, and the parallel expression of "Salvâ ecclesiæ dignitate," for which Becket and his party contended. Of course nothing was settled, but matters were rather more embroiled, and the prospect of reconciliation considerably decreased. The king, however, gained an important point in the absolution of the excommunicated, and in particular in that of the Bishop of London—an act which Becket considered as the turning point in the contest, and in every respect a most serious and discouraging blow. The special leave of the Pope was required for the absolution of Foliot; this his personal weight and powerful interest at Rome soon obtained. Afraid of the remonstrances of Becket and his friends, the letter from the Pope granting absolution required that the fact should be kept secret, at least for a time, as his letter expressed it, "until it could be divulged without danger to the bishop." * On

* Ep. v. 15:—"Donec absque ipsius periculo episcopi valeat propalari." Becket's friends give another reason. (Ep. v. 23). "Sed dicitur eos jurasse, quod stabunt mandato Domini Papæ, idque precipitur occultari ne forte innotescat aliquid pro ecclesiâ gestum, quod ad ipsius pertineat honestatem."

Easter-day the absolution took place, and exposed the weakness, the vacillation, and indifference of the Roman court.

The defence of his kingdom from the dangers of an interdict had long ago determined Henry in obtaining the coronation of his son as King of England during his own life. The opposition of the primate, to whom the right of crowning immemorially belonged, had as yet hindered him from putting his design into execution; and, although Henry had applied to the Pope for permission to have the ceremony performed by other hands, as yet he had been unable to obtain any countenance to his scheme. Whether or not such a permission was given, is the point now to be discussed.

And here we are once more at variance with Mr. Froude, or rather with his unknown continuator, who, arguing from the printed edition of the letters, and from that alone, correctly determines that Henry never did obtain this desired permission. Lord Lyttleton, however, discovered, in that very beautiful MS. of Becket's letters with which the Cotton collection is enriched, a letter from Pope Alexander to the Archbishop of York, granting the required permission for the coronation. Now though we could very well believe that, at the time of the editing of the printed edition, such a letter might have been designedly suppressed, and that the monkish biographers of Becket might also have concealed the existence of a letter which made so very much against the cause which they were advocating, still we should have regarded it with suspicion had we, as Lord Lyttleton did, found it in one MS. alone. However, on carefully examining the MS. at Lambeth Palace, we found this self-same letter, not only the same in meaning, but almost *totidem verbis*. By this letter it will be seen, Alexander, after commenting on the good conduct of the king, and his petition for the coronation of his son, by the authority of the blessed Peter and himself, permits the coronation to be performed within the realm of England; and thus prohibits Becket from assisting, unless previously reconciled to the king. The letter then goes on to grant, by the authority of the holy see, permission to the Archbishop of York to perform the ceremony in the place of the exiled primate.* The authority given in this letter tallies with

---

* *Alexander Papa Rogero Eboracensi Archiepiscopo.*

"Quanto per carissimum filium nostrum, Henricum illustrem Anglorum Regem, ampliora commoda et incrementa in hujus necessitatis articulo ecclesiæ Dei pervenisse noscuntur, et quanto nos eum pro suæ devotionis constantia majori affectione diligimus et cariorem in nostris visceribus retinemus, tanto ad ea quæ ad honorem incrementum et exaltationem ipsius et suorum cognoscimus pertinere libentius et promptius aspiramus. Inde est utique, *quod, ad ejus petitionem*, dilectum filium nostrum, Henricum, primogenitum filium suum, com-

that which was previously granted by Alexander to Roger of York, in an early letter, in which, after he has confirmed the ancient grant of bearing the cross, he adds the power of crowning the king, sicut ex literis antecessorum nostrum, predecessoribus tuis concessum est, et sicut eosdem predecessores tuos constat ex antiquum fuisse. This power may only refer to assisting at the coronation; the fact, however, is worthy of remark. Respecting this other and all important letter, we are the more inclined to believe its authenticity, when we consider that the chief attempt made against it has been to cavil at one word in the letter, and not to show the probability of its being a forgery, from the supposed rarity of its occurrence, but rather to try to persuade people that Lord Lyttleton was wrong in the reading of the Cotton MS., and to explain away the force of the letter, by making it thus a mere permission to the Archbishop of York to assist in the ceremony, so far as was belonging to his office. First, let us observe, that no one, in the slightest degree acquainted with MSS., can read the disputed word into "quanto," or any thing like; and secondly, where would be the necessity of the Pope granting a license to the archbishop to do what was part of his official duty—a grant entirely inconsistent with the beginning of the letter? As a further argument in favour of the authority of this letter, it should be remembered that it tallies with the assertion made, at the time of the coronation, by the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London, that they had obtained the Pope's consent to the coronation being performed by the hands of the latter, or any other bishop. Can we believe that men of such characters, therefore, would have either wilfully stated an untruth, or forged the letter by which the authority was conveyed?

When it is remembered what the conduct of the Pope had been regarding the legatine commission, the suspension of Becket, and the absolution of Foliot, surely it may be credited, that, within a very short time after this letter, he sent other letters to Becket, expressly forbidding the bishops, and especially the Archbishop of York, from doing anything to the detriment of Becket's rights in the coronation of the prince; or that he afterwards suspended the Archbishop of York for the very act for which he had so lately given his

municato fratrum nostrorum concilio, *ex auctoritate Beati Petri ac nostrâ concedimus in Anglia coronandum. Quoniam* igitur hoc had officium tuum pertinet fraternitati vestræ *per Apostolica Scripta mandamus*, quatenus, cum ab eodem filio nostro rege, propter hoc fueris requisitus, *coronam memorato filio suo, ex auctoritate sedis Apostolicæ imponas, et nos quod a te exinde factum fuerit, ratum ac firmum decernimus permanere.* Tu vero debitam ei subjectionem et reverentiam, salvo in omnibus patris sui mandato, exhibeas et alios similiter commoneas exhibere."—*Lambeth MS., fol.* 246 *b and* 247 *a*; *Cotton MS., Claudius, b.* 11 *b. 2, fol.* 288.

written permission, and guaranteed him scatheless from all its consequences.

These letters of prohibition never arrived in England, in consequence of the careful watch placed over the sea-ports, by which all suspicious messengers and dispatches were prevented from entering the kingdom. In the absence of these, and in obedience to the former letter, the Archbishop of York performed the ceremony, and Henry for the time was triumphant.

It was immediately after this that Henry, through fear of the interdict which the Pope had, with his usual consistency, authorized to be put into force, unless the king immediately came to the required terms, agreed to the meeting at Fretville. We wish we had space to quote the account, given by John of Salisbury, of this extraordinary meeting; we must, however, be content with Becket's own summary of the proceedings:—

"The King of England forthwith made peace with us, to the honour of God, as we would hope, and the great advantage of his Church. The usages, which were once so insisted on, he did not even mention. He exacted no oath of us, or of any belonging to us. He restored to us the possessions which we had been deprived of, according to the enumeration of them in our own schedule, and with them peace and security, and a return from exile to all our companions; and even promised the kiss of peace, if we wished to press him so far. In short, he gave way in everything, insomuch that some called him perjured, who had heard him swear that he would not admit us to the kiss that day." *

Until evening they conversed together alone, as familiarly as in the days of their friendship; and this, though all that could be obtained from the archbishop was forgiveness in the most vague and general terms, in return for such unbounded concessions on the part of his sovereign.

Thus† ended this most extraordinary meeting, in which every point that had been the subject of the seven years' contest was given up, without a moment's hesitation. Difficult as it un-

* Epist. v. 45; taken from Mr. Froude's translation, p. 503.

† It was about this time that, according to the authors of one of the services for the day of St. Thomas à Becket, he was audibly informed by God of his ultimate martyrdom, and the glory that would ensue to the Church by his death.

"Laude Thoma, martis die,
Vocem audiens Messiæ,
Cum esses in Francia;
Thoma, Thoma, dixit deus,
Sanguis tuus, erit meus
Honor in Ecclesiâ."

Taken from a missal in the Arundel MS., which contains an illumination of the murder of Becket—an uncommon occurrence in English missals, from the rigour with which Henry the Eighth's orders against the *name* and *portrait* of Becket were executed.

doubtedly is to come to any just opinion respecting the conduct of both parties at this conference, we have no hesitation in entering our decided protest against that unfair and uncharitable view of the case which has been taken by Mr. Froude's continuator:—

"One of the archbishop's historians, however (says that writer), writing some time after these events, and when information had come out to throw light upon them, gives an easy explanation of the whole conference:—'The king (says Fitzstephen) had the question put to him by some one, either in a letter or in a conversation—"*Why is the archbishop kept out of the country? He will be far better in than out?*" The hint was given to one who understood it. The king forthwith arranged a conference to treat of a peace, and there conceded everything which before he had refused. But first (the passage goes on) he caused his son to be crowned with dispatch, on account of a certain result which might possibly take place; so that if a crime were committed, the kingdom could not be punished on his account, seeing he would no longer be king of it.'" (Froude, p. 497).

Now this charge of cold-blooded malice prepense against the king we at once refuse to believe in; because so entirely inconsistent is it with the well known temper and feelings of Henry, that we would hardly accede to it, even if every cotemporary writer had witnessed to its truth. When, however, we do find (admitting the author's account of Fitzstephen's opinion to be true)—when, we say, we do find that this idea is not only entirely unsupported by any cotemporary biographer, by any fragment of a fragment of a quotation from any of the letters, but is also diametrically opposed to the views entertained respecting the meeting by John of Salisbury and Becket himself, as developed in their accounts of the conference—we reject this wonderful discovery of that professed collector of rumours and anecdotes, Fitzstephen, as a vile calumny. Before, however, we conclude on this point, let us inform our friends, that Fitzstephen does not assert that the king had the question put to him in the way Mr. Froude's continuator would have us to believe; he relates it as nothing more than a mere rumour: "*Dictum fuit aliquem dixisse*" are his words; probably of as much weight and authority as the "*they say*," or "*it is rumoured*," or the "*we have heard*," of a modern newspaper paragraph. Such a quotation is hardly creditable to the unknown continuator, editor, friend, or reviser, whoever he may be. And although we may be willing to agree (with Dr. Short), that at this meeting "the gentlemanly feeling of the king was displayed," we can hardly allow that the conduct of Becket was that of revengeful pride. We must, however, admit that the refusal of forgiveness in all, save general,

terms, might have enabled the primate to carry on his secret machinations for war, whilst his words bore the semblance of peace.

The shameless conduct of many of those who enjoyed the sequestered lands of Canterbury, their resistance to the authority of the see, their threats of violence towards its officers, imperatively demanded the presence of Becket. He asked permission of Henry to return, and, if necessary, die for his flock; it was readily granted. Of the Pope he sought full powers over his opponents, and letters of excommunication and suspension against the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of London and Salisbury, on account of their conduct at the coronation. Ere these powers arrived, Becket had two interviews with his sovereign: at the first, all was cold and ceremonious; bitter taunts and acrimonious expostulations passed freely between them—the one redolent with the pride of his new authority, the other embittered in his temper by a long and painful illness. At the next meeting, the old affection of the king burst forth: "Oh, my good lord (said Henry), why will you not do what I desire? I would then put all into your hands!" The conduct of Becket soon checked this affectionate feeling; and had Henry but known the arrogant and unprovoked application of the Scripture, "All this will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me," we should want no further excuse for his subsequent refusal of the kiss of peace.

The three letters against the prelates having now arrived from the same power that had previously granted them the license for those very acts for which they were now to be punished, Becket left for Rouen, where Henry promised to meet him, and to provide him with the requisite viatica. The political events of the time called Henry far away, and the supply of money being not forthcoming, the primate, having borrowed of the Archbishop of Rouen the necessary sum, set forward for the coast, once more to renew the contest between the civil and ecclesiastical authority.

Through the means of Idonea, an enthusiast nun, the sentences were fulminated in England, previous to the departure of Becket from the port of Whitsand, between Calais and Boulogne. Nerved for victory or death, he prepared to land at Sandwich, where the sheriff of Kent, by that time sensible of the success of Idonea's mission, warned him from entering the land as an enemy to the new crowned king, and besought his remaining, at least for a time, on ship-board. Becket refused, and prepared to land.

"The poor of the place (says Mr. Churton) flocked to his landing, having seen out at sea the archbishop's silver cross on board the vessel,

and cried aloud, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, the father of orphans and the judge of the widow's cause.'"

Such was Becket's disembarkation: and here let us pause to consider Mr. Churton's unwarrantable and unprovoked attack on Dr. Southey; it is contained in the following note:—

"The impious application of Scripture must have been suggested by the priests, when these simple people spread their garments in the way and sang 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.' (Southey's 'Book of the Church,' chap. viii.) On this it should be remarked, that no old historian says they did spread their garments in the way, but only that they *trussed them up*, to help the archbishop to land, as Dover sailors may still do when they help a lady or gentleman at the landing-place. As to the impiety, is there any in receiving a Christian bishop in the name of his Master?"

After this attack on one now, alas! for us, but happily for Mr. Churton, no longer able to vindicate his own writings—writings which have stood the test of controversy and time—would it be believed that there is not a shadow of an authority for the charge?—that it cannot be supported even for a moment, except by a garbled quotation from the "Book of the Church?" In the eighth chapter of that book, page 136 of the fourth edition, Mr. Southey gives his account of the landing of Becket.

"He landed at Sandwich, a port inhabited by his own tenantry; they, he well knew, would receive him with sincere joy—the transfer of Church property to lay hands being always to the detriment of the tenants. His reception was such as he expected; but the nun had performed her commission." He then speaks of the opposition offered to his landing, and the attempt to force the oath of allegiance on one of his followers, who was a foreigner; and then concludes his account of the landing in these words:—"The point was not pressed by the sheriff, who feared the temper and numbers of the people." Such is Mr. Southey's account of the *landing* at Sandwich, without one word about spreading of garments, or anything like it. But this account of the landing concluded, Mr. Southey, with his usual accuracy, proceeds to recount the manner of the primate's entry into Canterbury, making the right and proper distinction between that and the landing at Sandwich. "Becket then proceeded to Canterbury. He was met by all the poor and peasantry of the country..... Hope, gratitude, and personal attachment, led them to welcome him with every demonstration of joy. But the impious application of Scripture must have been suggested by the priests, when these simple people spread their garments in the way before him," &c. ("Book of the Church," p. 137). So that it appears that Mr. Southey

never made the mistake, but only Mr. Churton for him; thus, in his great kindness, affording a new example of the fallacy of quotation for the next edition of "Whately's Logic." Like the quack doctor, he originates the disease to show off his own panacea, and falls a victim to it himself, through the insufficiency of his own patent medicine.

Mr. Churton must excuse us; we have not done with him yet. "No old historian (says our new historian) says they spread their garments in the way, but only that they trussed them up, to help the archbishop to land," &c. Now this is true—yes, perfectly true, that no historian, from the writers of the "Quadriloge" to Mr. Southey, ever yet asserted that *at the landing* the poor spread their garments in the way; and it is also perfectly true that the writers of the "Quadriloge" do say, that *at the landing* the poor rushed into the water, tucking up their garments, to assist the disembarkation. But had Mr. Churton, when he read the "Quadriloge," and picked the "hos succinctos" out of the 112th page of the Brussels edition of 1682, read steadily on only as far as the middle of the very next page, he would have then discovered that, according to Mr. Southey's account, Becket did on the morrow proceed to Canterbury, and that wherever he passed the poor and the peasantry, of all ages, received him as a messenger from above, "some casting themselves in the path, and others casting off their garments and strewing them in the way," continually crying out, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." At the foot of the page * we have given the passages from the "Quadriloge" at full length, extracted from no crabbed, hardly legible manuscript, where the eye might, indeed, overlook a word or so, but from a printed book, of common occurrence, clear print, and good authority, and, as far as we can judge, the

* On the 112th page we find the passage which Mr. Churton has paraphrased:—"*In* navi vero archipresul, vexillo crucis, quod archi episcopi Cantuarienses tanquam totius Angliæ primates, coram se semper bajulare consueverunt, erecto; per quod navis ejus ab aliis discerni poterat, cum ad littus appropinquaret; *videres turbam pauperum, quæ venerat occursum, hos succintos ut prævenirent et patrem suum applicantem accipererent, et benedictionem præciperent,* alios vero se humi prosternantes, ejulantes, hos plorantes, illos prægaudio, et omnes conclamantes Benedictus qui venit in nomine Dei pater orphanorum et judex viduarum." (Quadril. 112). On the next page is the passage which Mr. Southey has translated:—"Archipresul vero in crastinis a sinu illo quo applicuit, distante a Cantuaria Sex Milliaria, Cantuariam proficiscens, a populo terræ tanquam hostia cælitus missa, tanquam ipse Dei angelus, tam gratanter quam ovanter exceptus est, quacunque enim transibat, *turbæ pauperum, parvuli et magni, senes enim cum junioribus glomeratim occurrebant, alii prosternentes se in via, alii vero exuentes vestimenta et prosternentes per viam,* illud frequenter iterantes et conclamantes Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini."

very book from which Mr. Churton obtained his "trussed up" paragraph. Such a specimen of misquotation and inaccuracy gives us no very high opinion of the whole work of the writer, or of the temper in which he sat down to compile his book—a temper very far from that in which such works should be undertaken.

The suspended prelates now sent messengers to Becket, to notify to him their appeal, which had been entered against his sentence, to the Pope, from whom they had obtained that permission to perform the ceremony, and for which permitted act they were now suspended. From the young king there came also officers, requiring the absolution of his servants the prelates. To these Becket answered, that "he, an inferior judge, could not release them from the sentence of a superior." (Epist. v. 73). As far as the Archbishop of York was concerned, this was true, as Becket had particularly desired that all discretionary power should be taken from him in that case; but as to the bishops, it was a virtual, if not an actual, falsehood, as, when applying for the revision of the power originally committed to him, he had thus written to the Pope:—"Further, inasmuch as we fear an unsettling of the late peace, which may from various causes arise, *we wish you to commit the excommunications and suspensions of the bishops to our own discretion, excepting the Archbishop of York,*" &c. (Epist. v. 52). On this the Pope altered the sentences, according to his request. Becket, however, afterwards offered to absolve them on his own responsibility, on their swearing to obey the injunctions of the Pope. This would have been accepted, had not Roger of York unhappily suggested the informality of the oath, unless sanctioned by the king. On this they retired to Normandy, to Henry, to seek redress for themselves and their clergy. Their advice was sought by the enraged monarch, and that advice tempted him once more to utter those fatal words, which, as

> "It is the curse of kings to be attended
> With slaves, who take their humours for a warrant
> To break within the bloody house of death,"

were the immediate cause of the murder of the primate. We say "once more," because John of Salisbury, in a letter written by him in 1166, four years before the death of Becket, records the occurrence of these very expressions:—"According to those who were present at the time, he (the king) asserted, with tears in his eyes, that the said archbishop would take from him body and soul; and, in conclusion, he called them all a set

of traitors, who had not zeal nor courage to rid him from the molestations of one man." (See Froude, p. 150).

We need not dilate on the closing scene of his life: his last posture was that of prayer—his last words those of Christian submission. Thus fell a man of rash and vehement temper, of undoubted ability and decision of character; very far from a fair opponent, and not over scrupulous in his means. Personally ambitious, he originally entered into the contest to combat for his own individual advantage, and secure to himself that temporal superiority, which, by his death, he obtained for his Church. In the latter days of his career, when he looked back on the severity of his persecutions, the bitterness of his kingly foe, the violent deprivation he had suffered of all his just rights, and the unfeeling visitation of his errors on the persons and property of his unoffending friends, can we wonder that he regarded himself, and with some reason, as a martyr in the Church's cause? The immunity from temporal jurisdiction which Becket had secured for the Church, by obtaining the Pope's fiat for annulling the constitutions of Clarendon, was of no long duration. The spirit of the English law, which these constitutions had embodied, was not extinguished, but merely suppressed for a time. In the reign of Henry III. more unremitted and successful efforts began to be made, which ended in the maintenance of the superiority of the common law over all persons in the realm.

The most prominent person among the English clergy, next to the archbishop, was Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of London, Becket's unwearied opponent, and the king's chief adviser, during the entire contest. Educated in the famous convent of Clugny, he soon became pre-eminent, among the learned and ascetic of that time, for his superior attainments and austerities. This, his reputation, in a few years obtained for him the high station of abbot in the Benedictine monastery of St. Peter's, Gloucester, from whence, in the year 1147, he was promoted to the see of Hereford. His learning, his abstinence, and voluntary poverty, acquired for him a yet more extended reputation, and rendered his influence most powerful, not only among the poor and the uneducated, but also among the rich, the noble, and the learned. Sixteen years after his promotion to the see of Hereford, Henry, with the advice, most probably, and certainly with the consent and written approbation of Becket, solicited the Pope to translate Gilbert to the important see of London.

"By hastening to comply with his holiness's mandate for your translation (says the king in his letter to Foliot), your lordship will confer a great obligation on myself; and, if possible, will even enhance the

affectionate regard which is already entertained for you by my barons. For it is in the city of London that, on all important occasions, my great national councils are assembled; and for this reason his holiness, in his solicitude to provide a fit pastor for such a see, out of his provident consideration for the welfare of my heirs and my realm, and wishing to give a more diffusive influence to the lustre of your virtues, has committed it to your charge."

The new primate sent with this flattering letter of Henry's one even more flattering. And now, when all these honours were heaped upon him, he swerved not a whit from his former habits; nay, more, his austerities increased, even to the risk of his life; and Pope Alexander, with good reason, might write him, "that he had good grounds for knowing that he afflicted and mortified his flesh to a degree which was neither fitting nor expedient," and to beseech him "not to persevere in such unnecessary rigours, nor to deprive his Maker of the services he required of him!" To use Mr. Froude's words, "he lived in the world without conforming to it; protesting against its ways by his own manner of living, and yet its favourite."

From the very commencement of this contest, Foliot had sided with his sovereign, and had been the chief butt against which the other side aimed their shafts. Strenuous as he was in defence of his own views and the constitutions of Clarendon; singled out as he was for all the violence of his opponents; constant in the defence of those principles of Church and State which he deemed to be involved in the recognition of the usages; unwearied in counteracting the schemes of the opposing party; he not only did not countenance the severities which the angry monarch inflicted on the archbishop and his friends, but he boldly and freely remonstrated with the sovereign on the cruelty of his conduct.

"Your highness's cause (said that virtuous prelate) does not appear to be forwarded by harsh treatment of those whom God has appointed his household servants—whom he has taken, as it were, into his family, and made attendant on his own table. *In this matter, though none else speak, yet will not I keep silence; though all despair, yet not I. Absent, therefore, in body, yet present in spirit, I exhort you, as you value your salvation, to adopt more wholesome courses.*"

His highly wrought appeal to the famous Earl of Norfolk is yet another example of his fearless and uncompromising character. The side which Foliot espoused was enough to make Mr. Froude look on him with distrust; though, perhaps, he would hardly have taken him to task so strongly, had he not discovered a little matter, in his eyes, partaking of Erastianism.

The Cave M.S. informs us, that a certain nobleman had

prompted a dependant of his to take forcible possession of a small farm, which by right belonged to a religious house in the diocese of London. The Pope, to whom the matter was referred, ordered the nobleman to enforce restoration, and should the demanded restoration be (as it was) refused, Foliot was forthwith to excommunicate the noble. This it was impossible to do without the king's consent, as the noble was a military tenant of the crown, and therefore defended by the laws of the Conquerer, as in the case of Eynesford. As the king did not grant the required permission, Foliot wrote a deprecatory letter to his friend, Cardinal William of Pavia, in which he states the difficulty to which he was reduced, between the commands of the pope and the king, and suggesting less severe measures. This respect for the law of the land is far too Erastian to suit Mr. Froude's taste; and therefore he is hinted at as one who "for one morsel of bread sold his birthright." Not having at present reasoned ourselves into the belief, that a disrespect for and disregard of all temporal law is a merit, in a Churchman, in matters ecclesiastical, we beg leave to dissent from this view of Foliot's character; nor do we discover any very light tone in Foliot's letter respecting state interference, or consider the horror which he expresses "at the notion of the censures of the Church, *i. e.*, the Pope, being directed against royalty," "very amusing."

Louis VII., the husband of Eleanor of Aquitaine, ten years after his accession to the throne, was persuaded by St. Bernard to lead a crusade to the Holy Land. Driven back with great loss and personal danger, he turned his attention to the conduct of his wife, whom he accused of improper behaviour during her residence in the East. Under the convenient plea of cousinship, and against the advice of the now deceased Suger, the marriage was dissolved, and the handsome heiress soon transferred her heart and her possessions to the gallant King of England. Nearly ten years of war between Louis and Henry was the consequence of this union, extending over the entire contest between Henry and Becket. This dispute was a boon to Louis, who regarded it as a sure and ever ready card. Ever eager to keep alive the dispute, as a thorn in the side of his powerful antagonist, he modified his support and regulated his assistance according as the one or the other party seemed to prevail. At one time, indeed, he seemed to cast off Becket, and to adhere with some honesty and sincerity to the cause of the king; but ere the day was well spent he was once and again reconciled to his discarded friend, with a rapidity and in a manner that partook of little sincerity and less honesty. As soon as he heard

of the murder of Becket, he caught at the event, and hastened to improve this opportunity of overwhelming his adversary, under the sanction and banner of the Church. He seemed lashed into an holy madness against Henry, and called upon the Pope to draw the sword of St. Peter and avenge the martyr, ready to pounce on his crippled foe and secure with impunity his share of the spoil.

As for the Pope, the precarious tenure of his power forbade him to use Rome's most choice weapons—arrogant boldness and daring assumption. At one time he seemed to cheer on Becket, and to reward his patience with his choicest gifts, filling his hands with suspensions, excommunications, and interdicts; and then, in the shortest possible time, or even at the same time, swayed to the king's side by threats or bribes, and strengthening the royal cause with antagonist weapons from the ecclesiastical armoury.

Henry, the ablest of our Norman kings, was the victim of the most uncontrollable fits of passion. Soon after the flight of Becket, whilst at Caen, during a discussion on Scotch affairs, Richard de Humet used some expression that seemed rather favourable to the Scotch. On this, Henry broke out into open abuse, calling him a traitor outright; during his passion, he tore off his cap, unloosed his girdle, and cast his pall and robe far from him, tore the silken covering of his couch, and seating himself down, as it were on a dung-hill, began to chew stalks of straw. When we read of such exhibitions as these, we cannot be astonished, however we may regret and condemn those occasional severities which he exercised against Becket and his party.

And it is only by bearing in mind this, his constitutional disease, that we can account for the fact of one so politic as Henry allowing himself to be betrayed into measures so suicidal, through the vehemence of his passion. No act could be more cruel than his persecution of the primate's innocent and unoffending relations; his appropriation of the revenues of the vacant sees was unwarrantable, though, to the shame of the times be it said, not unusual.

When we consider the wide extent of the pale of the Church, the vast multitudes that might claim exemption as clerics, and the *indiscreet* conduct of the bishops (to use Nicholas of Rouen's own words) in ordaining many persons without titles, who, in consequence, were "poor and ready for anything that was bad,"* we cannot but regard his demands on the Church as just and politic.

* Froude, p. 135.

In the claim which he made at Montmirail of the insertion of the clause, "Salvà regni dignitate," he was supported, not only by those of the English clergy and prelates who had espoused his cause from the very outbreak, and might be regarded as his partisans, inasmuch as they had so far compromised themselves; but also by the Archbishop of Rouen, and the whole body of the Norman clergy.

"We endeavoured* (said those prelates, in their letter to Alexander) to convince your (the Pope's) envoys, that placing the honour of God first, and next to that maintaining the ancient dignity of the realm, they should receive with gladness the formula touching the royal estate; which was, indeed, a most excellent one, and quite deserving their acceptance."

Again they say:—

"The royal estate by no means prejudices either the estate or liberty of the Church; rather the ecclesiastical estate advances the royal, and the royal preserves the ecclesiastical. The king cannot obtain salvation without the Church, or the Church security without the king's protection."

Such was the view entertained of the conduct of Henry by those who, from their situation, were enabled to offer an unbiassed opinion. When, too, he refused to recal Becket, in the earlier part of the dispute, surely his reason was valid: "We do not think it our business (said Henry) to recal one whom we never ordered to depart;" and one, he might have added, whose departure, being without royal permission, was a breach of the law of the realm. It is well known that Henry promised to restore to Becket all those portions of his archiepiscopal revenues and lands that had been alienated during the contest; and that the primate and his agents were in every way thwarted by the orders of the young king, when they endeavoured to execute the orders they had received from Becket. That Henry delayed to enforce his engagements no one can doubt, though it is not improbable that his failing health, and the troubles which his active enemy of France was raising for him, might have tended very far to this delay. What his intentions were when the primate sailed for England, the following letter distinctly shows:—

"THE KING OF ENGLAND TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

"Your lordship must know that I am unable to meet you at Rouen at the time appointed, inasmuch as it has been signified to me, by my friends in France, that the King of the French is preparing himself to attack my liegemen of Auverne, and to injure them and my land. I

* Froude, p. 448.

have also heard to the same effect from the people of Auverne themselves, who pray for succour. For this reason I cannot meet you at Rouen at the time we arranged. *But I send to you my friend and cleric, John, Dean of Salisbury, to attend you to England, and by him I send instructions to King Henry, my son, to restore to you all your possessions in peace and honour. If any matters affecting your lordship may appear to have been left incomplete, he will arrange them.*"* &c.

On the authority of one who was for many years his most intimate friend, Peter of Blois, Archdeacon of London, Henry "did not, as other kings, lie idle in his palace, but went through his provinces, examining into every one's conduct, and particularly that of the persons he had appointed judges of them. No one was more shrewd in council, ready in speaking, careful in prosperity, self-possessed in danger. If he once formed an attachment for any one, he seldom gave him up; if he once took a real aversion to a person, he seldom admitted him afterwards to any familiarity." Such was the opinion of one who was of high repute in his day; a Churchman in power, and a firm believer in the saintship of Thomas of Canterbury.

Henry's conduct at the meeting at Clarendon was just and honourable; at Northampton he allowed his passion and desire for revenge to outweigh his sense of equity; at Montmirail and Fretville his desire for reconciliation, and "his gentlemanly feeling," were displayed; whilst his final anger against Becket, for his unjustifiable conduct towards the bishops, was so natural, that, had it not been so appalling in its effects, it would have passed off unnoticed by his opponents, and been easily justified by his friends; and it would not have required the abject penance which he underwent, to have freed him from the charge of having not only countenanced, but plotted the death of his former friend.

Before we conclude, let us notice one point, which has been forced upon us by our perusal of the "Becket Letters;" a point more interesting than important: the unchristian and uncourteous expressions with which those letters are replete. When it is remembered that the authors of these epistles are popes, kings, and clerics—the most noble, most learned, and most Christian persons of that time—it cannot but be a matter of astonishment to all, who are not intimately acquainted with the not only very bad taste, but very unchristian language, which is to be discovered in the letters of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

To commence with the bad taste of John of Salisbury, who,

* Epist. v. 44; Froude, p. 536.

in one of his letters, written from Paris to Becket, soundly asserts of the Bishop of Lisieux, "that there is nothing he will hesitate to assert;" and in another letter calls him "the mallet of iniquity, made for grinding down the Church of God." Of the English bishops the same cleric asserts—"Some had married wives, and were enervated; others had bought yokes of oxen; others had been heaping up riches, not telling who should gather them; all were engrossed in pleasures of one sort or other; and therefore they chose, I say, to have their ears bored with an awl, and to make themselves as bondmen for ever to the iniquitous usages, rather than be elevated to spiritual liberty." In the same letter he charges them with idolatries and bodily defilements, in most unchristian language. Again, in speaking of the king, he says "there is nothing so impious towards God, or so inhuman towards man, that would not readier (than his justice, &c.) be believed of him throughout France and Italy." Thus much as a specimen of John of Salisbury, unless we may charge him with a certain kind and charitable letter, written to Becket by some friend at Caen, concerning the intended coronation of the prince; in which he informs the primate that he is to "know for certain that this business is to take place without delay; and that even though York himself should shrink from taking part in it, yet the *hangman of sees*"—only the bishop—"would lay *on his bloody hands.*" * The expressions of some of the writers of this time place us in a very unpleasant dilemma; we must either (to cite an instance) regard the writer—in this case, Gerard Pucelle—as a base calumniator, or with him believe that two such men as the cardinals, Henry of Pisa and William of Pavia, were, the "one light and capricious, the other crafty and intriguing;" and that "presents would easily shut their eyes, and reconcile them to any wickedness." † The primate, too, seems to have fallen into the custom of the times, when he desires his friend the Pope "to send back John of Oxford with the brand of the beast on his forehead;" and denounces the primate of York, and the Bishop of London in especial, and all those of the clergy who sided with the king, "as priests of Baal and sons of the false prophets;" ‡ and also when he tells the Bishop of Nivers "that he is to look with suspicion on everything the king says, and always believe a fraud to be intended, unless his acts manifestly vouch for his sincerity." §

There is yet another letter which we cannot refrain from

---

* Froude, p. 486; Epist. v. 11.
† Epist. i. 111; Froude, p. 216.
‡ Epist. v. 73; Froude, p. 539.
§ Epist. v. 12; Froude, p. 467.

quoting—that in which Becket lays his commands on Idonea, to deliver the sentences against the prelates, for their share in the coronation of the young king:—

"God hath chosen the weak things of this world to confound the strong. The pride of Holophernes, which exalted itself against God, when the warriors and priests failed, was extinguished by the valour of a woman. When the apostles fled and denied their Lord, women attended him in his sufferings, followed him after his death, and received the firstfruits of the resurrection. You, my daughter, are animated with their zeal; God grant that you may pass into their society. The spirit of love hath cast out fear from your heart, and will bring it to pass that the things which the necessity of the Church demands of you, arduous though they be, shall appear not only possible but easy. Having this hope of your zeal in the Lord, I command you, *and for the remission of your sins enjoin on you*, that you deliver the letters which I send you from his Holiness the Pope to our venerable brother Roger, Archbishop of York, in the presence, if possible, of our brethren and fellow-bishops. My daughter, a great prize is offered for your toil, *remission of sins*—a fruit that perisheth not—the crown of glory, which, in spite of all the sins of their past lives, the blessed sinners of Magdala and Egypt have received from Christ their Lord. The Lady of Mercies will attend on you, and will entreat her Son, whom she bore for the sins of the world, God and man, to be the guide, guard, and companion of your steps. He who burst the bonds of death and curbed the violence of devils, is not unable to restrain the impious hand that will be raised against you. Farewell, *bride of Christ*, and ever think on his presence with you." (Epist. v. 72; Froude, 54).

It will be seen that all our proofs of bad taste and unchristian feeling are from the letters of Becket and his friends, and that not one instance has been produced from the correspondence of the king and his party. Let it not be supposed, however, that the former faction alone are guilty of this fault. Those who are in the slightest degree acquainted with the letters of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and know aught of the anathemas of Cardinal Damiain, and the foul abuse which one of Henry's most intimate friends, Peter of Blois, lavishes on princes, popes, and prelates, when thwarted in the slightest matters, will readily believe, that had we the private correspondence of the king's party as we have of the Becket party, and were not confined, in the former case, to public remonstrances and diplomatic correspondence, where every word is carefully weighed, and every sentence wrought into a decent and respectable form, we should have quite as many specimens of bad taste and bad feeling in the letters of the monarchical as we have in those of the archiepiscopal party.

As we hope ere long to develope the resources which the letters of the eleventh and twelfth centuries afford for a history

of the moral and intellectual state of the Church, not only in England, but in the whole world, in those times, let us now conclude our account of this most important and interesting dispute—a dispute that, had it not been for the jealous enmity of the King of France, might have gone far to ante-date the Reformation by many centuries.

ART. V.—*Church Principles Considered in their Results.* By W. E. GLADSTONE, Esq., late Student of Christ Church, and M.P. for Newark. London: Murray and Hatchard. 1840.

2. *The Sermons of the Rev. Robert Sanderson, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. With a Life,* by ISAAC WALTON; *and an Introduction,* by the Rev. ROBERT MONTGOMERY, M.A., of Lincoln College, Oxford. London: Ball and Arnold. 1841.

"THERE is nothing contrary to God in the whole world (said Cudworth, in a sermon before the House of Commons); nothing that fights against him but self-will. This is the strong castle that we all keep garrisoned against Heaven in every one of our hearts, which God continually layeth siege unto: and it must be conquered and demolished before we can conquer Heaven. It was by reason of this self-will that Adam fell in Paradise; that those glorious angels, those morning stars, kept not their first station, but dropped down from Heaven like falling stars, and sunk into that condition of bitterness, anxiety, and wretchedness, in which they now are. They all entangled themselves with the length of their own wings; they would needs will more and otherwise than God would will in them; and going about to make their wills wider, and to enlarge them into greater amplitude, the more they struggled they found themselves the faster pinioned; insomuch that now they are not able to use any wings at all, but, inheriting the serpent's curse, can only creep with their bellies upon the earth. Now our only way to recover God and happiness is, not to soar up with our understandings, but to destroy this self-will of ours; and then we shall find our wings to grow again, our plumes fairly spread, and ourselves raised aloft into the free air of perfect liberty, which is perfect happiness." If the members of the legislature needed such an admonition from the lips of Cudworth, much more is it required in this age of lawlessness, when every argument that sophistry can invent is directed against all authority, and the highest felicity is thought

to be only attainable by securing to human will uncontrolled dominion. Under the specious, but profane, adaptation to religious objects of the Reform cry, "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," doctrines are diffused that directly contravene the verities of God's word. Human choice is in these days made the basis of religion; man is to be his own standard; and by his debased and perverted judgment are all things in heaven and in earth to be tried. Truly the spirit of lawlessness now walks the earth, τὸ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας. Amidst much, however, to make us mourn, we are thoroughly convinced that a deep sense of religion has somehow or other reached the heart's core of this nation, and abides there with power and practical energy. The production of a book like the one before us, not from the pen of a recluse student or grave divine, but of a legislator; a man moving in the world of action, and still young in years; the favour this volume is winning to the principles it promulges—nay, the very animosity it awakens in some quarters—are so many proofs to us that the deadly reign of indifference is ended, and that warfare is begun which shall be accomplished in the triumph of truth. Mr. Gladstone feels no surprise, we are quite sure, at the charges brought against him of propagating Romish doctrines; and is imbued, we believe, with too Catholic a spirit to be wroth with those who cannot discern between what is papal and what is apostolical.

For ourselves we are persuaded, without professing a concurrence with every single proposition advanced by Mr. Gladstone, that, substantially, the principles he advocates are those of apostolical antiquity, and those most opposed to the modern errors of Popery. The Church of England has far more to fear *from Geneva and its rationalistic spirit*, than from Rome and her traditions; and should she ever fall, which may the Most High forbid, will be thrown down by those who would weed her communion of all that is ancient, and primitive, and apostolic. But, although she may be depressed, she shall not be utterly cast down, for we firmly believe the Church of England has to perform an important part in the regeneration of the world; that ἀποκαταστάσις πάντων which St. Peter preached, and affirmed that all the holy prophets had predicted. It appears to us most probable that the Church of England, properly understood, cordially adhered to, knowingly valued, and adequately expanded, will be fitted to draw to itself, as a delightful centre of unity, all that is great and good, all that is wise, and pure, and holy, and of good report, and be the city of habitation, not only for such as escape from Babylon, but also for those who have long been wandering in the wilderness. The English Church is the only

one which has been equally mindful, at the same time, to bring out of the divine treasury things new and old. The English Church is the only one which does not shock good sense on the one hand, or good taste on the other.

With what graphic and truthful force George Herbert describes this intermediate position of the British Church:

"I joy, dear mother, when I view
Thy perfect lineaments, and hue,
Both sweet and bright:
Beauty in thee takes up her place,
And dates her letters from thy face
When she doth write.

"A fine aspect in fit array,
Neither too mean, not yet too gay,
Shows who is best:
Outlandish looks may not compare,
For all they either painted are,
Or else undrest.

"She on the hills which wantonly
Allureth all, in hope to be
By her preferred,
Hath kiss'd so long her painted shrines,
That e'en her face by kissing shines,
For her reward.

"She in the valley is so shy
Of dressing, that her hair doth lie
About her ears:
While she avoids her neighbour's pride
She wholly goes on the other side,
And nothing wears.

"But, dearest mother, (what those miss)
The mean thy praise and glory is,
And long may be.
Blessed be God, whose love it was
To double-moat thee with his grace,
And none but thee."

The English Church is the only one opposed to novelty, and yet open to advancement. The English Church is the only one which has fully imbibed the truly Catholic and Apostolic spirit. But we speak less of what she at this moment actually is, than what we humbly hope she will be; at present, she is trampled down and trodden under foot

by those who pretend to defend her by their secular arm. The wild boar out of the wood doth waste, and the beast of the field doth devour her. Still we cannot but think, in her invaluable and matchless liturgy, there is such a manifest improvement and advancement, on what has been done before in the Church Catholic, as to give something more than an earnest of what, in a fit time and under fit hands, she will be, when all in every place shall lift up their voices, in accordant harmony, to the great King of heaven and earth. It is not only incomplete, and consequently imperfect, but admirably accords with the spirit and feeling breathed by Catholic antiquity, while that which is new so harmonizes with the old as scarcely to be distinguished from it. What an approach, then, has there not been made to the whole Church speaking the same thing, and with the same mouth glorifying God, which must eventually take place, or our Lord's prayer will be unfulfilled. By taking care to drink into His Spirit from day to day, through His ordained means of grace, we only can escape the changeable, fluctuating, unsettled, and versatile religion of the times, and hope to keep ourselves unspotted from the world. We say the world, for what is the mass of persons making a profession of religion but the world, seeing the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, and the pride of life, have never been eschewed by them in deed and in truth? Among the classes which, in the arrogant phraseology of Exeter Hall, are designated the religious public, a proud, uncharitable, condemnatory spirit is but too prevalent. Man cannot brook a superior; he would be as God; he hates to submit himself to those in authority; he is not afraid to speak evil of dignities; he abhorreth not to sit in the seat of the scornful; he trembles not at the word of God. This is being wise overmuch and righteous overmuch with a vengeance, but it is the tone and temper of a large portion of the "religious public." But it seems to us quite plain, that when men's minds come to be disabused, and their hearts raised to feel the value of spiritual and eternal realities, they will find, where they have too long neglected to look for it, a centre of unity in the body of Catholic truth, handed down from age to age, and in a most wonderful manner preserved to our day. All who know anything of its transmission from the earliest times will see and admire therein the wisdom, and power, and goodness of God. Our Lord has not left his Church at any season to carry on her warfare with the powers of darkness alone; and although her garments have been rent and torn, and her children made to go into bondage, or driven into exile, yet is she still dear to Him who holdeth her up by His right hand. Her's is the

glory of the apostolic priesthood, and the commission to evangelize the world, and the ministration of righteousness, and the conveyance of pardoning mercy to the penitent, and the giving of the body and blood of our Lord to the believer, and the possession of a treasure which cannot be spent or wasted, or come to an end. Would that our sad and lamentable differences were healed, and that with child-like reverence we listened to the voice of our mother speaking to us the words of wisdom and instruction. It bodes ill to a house when those who should uphold, undermine it. Our divisions do more to injure us than all our enemies can do against us.

We are quite prepared for a voice from the conventicle, and also the liberal conceding section which professes an attachment to the Establishment, as the Church is too often called by those whose notions of her office and dignity are such as they would entertain of a sort of religious club. From these quarters we anticipate a voice exclaiming, "Why do you not agree with us, who are so many? Are not you the schismatics, who will not abate the least tittle, but must have all your own way?" Alas! such parties see not that to agree with them would be to disagree with the Universal Church, and to join with them would be to separate ourselves from the mystical body of Christ. For it is certain that what is now called heresy in many quarters was the faith once delivered to the saints, and that the name of Popery is given to practices which the word of God sanctions and all antiquity enjoins. The Catholic Church gives an unvarying testimony to the truth, and apostolicity, and sanctity of certain things, which many in the present day can only look upon as beggarly elements and childish trifles. "The present age (says an author whose name we will presently mention) may, in matters of religion, be justly called the age of self-sufficiency. We condemn the ancients by wholesale, and without giving them a hearing; we suspect their historical accounts without discrimination—malevolence and profaneness are both encouraged by such conduct; we fancy ourselves so enlightened as to be without any parallel in discernment; we are amazed that our ancestors should so long have been deluded by absurdities; and we are very little aware how much some future age will pity or blame us for follies of which we imagine ourselves perfectly clear." The same author, in commenting upon Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, makes these remarks:—"The attentive reader cannot but observe how the same evil (schism) prevails in our day, to the great injury of real piety; and yet how little it is deplored: rather how much encouraged and promoted by specious representations of liberty,

of the right of private judgment, of a just contempt of implicit faith, and of pleas of conscience. Doubtless, from these topics there are deducible arguments of great moment, and which deserve the most serious attention in practical concerns; but at present it is not my province to explain the *middle path* in this subject, nor *to prove that modern Evangelical Churches are far gone into the vicious extreme of schism.*" The author who thus expresses himself is no writer of "Tracts for the Times," no high Oxford doctor, but the late Joseph Milner; and that our readers may satisfy themselves of the accuracy of our quotations, we will add that the first is the conclusion of his Introduction to his "History of the Church of Christ," and the second is from page 125, volume i., of the same work. But what would Joseph Milner have written had he been living now? He complained of the "self-sufficiency" of the generation among which his lot was cast, when rationalism was but in its bud—not the deadly yet flourishing tree whose branches now overshadow the divinity chair of Luther and the pulpit of Calvin.

We will now proceed to the principles considered in Mr Gladstone's volume, which, to omit the mention of minor points on which a greater diversity of opinion may be permitted to prevail, particularly are, the doctrine of the visibility of the Church, the apostolical succession in the ministry, the authority of the Church in controversies of faith, and of the things signified in the sacraments. The practical results of these principles upon our relations, as members of the Anglican Church, with one other, and with the members of other religious communions, under the peculiar circumstances of the present day, are, in our opinion, lucidly demonstrated. The author avows it to be his wish to show—and we think he has, to a considerable extent, succeeded in showing—that "neither as respects our own communion, nor as it respects the Romanists, nor as it respects the Dissenters, ought we to find in these principles anything but the means of consolidated strength, of quickened responsibility, and of extended charity."

"This work of disarming prejudice (continues Mr. Gladstone), although it be altogether secondary to that of producing actual and direct conviction, is one at no time to be lightly thought of, but in particular not to be neglected at a period when almost the whole of the opposition to these principles has proceeded, not so much upon the question of their theological truth or falsehood, as upon that of the inconveniences with respect to the members of the Church and of other bodies, supposed to follow logically from their recognition; that is, it has tended not so much to attack conviction directly, as to sap or to

impede it by accumulating hostile prejudice. The inverse process is that which I propose; and it is one which a man living in the world of politics, as opposed to one living in studious retirement—a layman, as contradistinguished from a minister of the Church—may, perhaps, whatever be his countervailing defects, undertake thus far not without some comparative advantage. For in situations where the religion we profess is undisturbed and alone, where it seems to enjoy the most venerable and undisputed prescriptions, it might be scarcely possible for us adequately to appreciate the difficulties arising from the hostile contact of other forms of faith, or to consider in detail, with the requisite nearness of view, its power of self-adaptation to the task of overcoming those difficulties. But those who live where their religion must be constantly subject to assault or imputation—where a thousand shafts are openly or obliquely aimed at it—where, at the least, it is subject to the competition and the collision of all the bodies, Romanist and Protestant, which have separated from the Church—these are inclined, by their daily life, to a strictly practical manner of considering the question: it is not easy for them to avoid perceiving its difficulties, and they will be less suspected of a disposition to extenuate or hide them."

Before Mr. Gladstone addresses himself to the discussion of the several topics we have already alluded to, as the heads under which Church principles are developed, he attacks the pernicious error of rationalism which haunts and infects the present age in a thousand forms. We regard rationalism as the radical principle of all heresy, which teaches that we are to accept, as parts of revelation, or to reject as spurious, any doctrine claiming to be of Christian faith, according to our own judgment of its reasonableness. Contrary to the express declaration of Christ himself, and the uniform tenor of the apostolical epistles, it is now sought to subordinate faith to human nature, instead of yielding up human nature to faith. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." The path of obedience alone leads to the path of knowledge. Our will and affections must be submitted to the law of God before our understanding can comprehend it. No doubt this is unreasonable, according to the language and the notions of a carnal, self-sufficient generation; but it is true, and, be it sweet or bitter to the natural taste, must be received by whosoever would be a member of Christ's Holy Catholic Church. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Such is the clearly enunciated doctrine of St. Paul, flatly contradicted by the rationalistic theories of the day, which maintain that the natural man can know and receive divine truth, and so much so, that his reception or

rejection of it is to be to the conscience the legitimate criterion of its reality, its truth, or its falsehood.

The grosser form of rationalism is that according to which the natural understanding is the adequate and final judge of all matters purporting to be revealed. But Mr. Gladstone ably points out subtler shapes assumed by this evil spirit, which pervert the minds of many who entertain an honest aversion to the noxious principle in the abstract. That the understanding, having been impaired by the fall with our other faculties, needs correction, is readily admitted by many who still display their rationalistic inclinations, by contending that the concurrence of the human understanding is a necessary and uniform condition of the entrance of any vital influence of religion into the human being. This error Mr. Gladstone exposes in a masterly manner, and shows how perfectly reasonable, as well as thoroughly scriptural, is the argument that Christianity, in its highest character, is "*a religion of influences which transcend, though they do not oppose, the understanding.*" Man's affections precede his understanding in their respective developments, and therefore the human being is capable of having right or wrong affections at an earlier period of his existence than that at which he becomes capable of having such right or wrong affections engendered by any intellectual process. It is the very substance of the charge against the actual human nature, that truth has lost its power over the understanding, in a practical and moral sense; or, in Mr. Gladstone's words, "its impelling power."

"The link, therefore, is broken in man which should have connected his convictions and his actions. Given right affections, and therefore right primary notions, the understanding will do the rest, and conduct faithfully to a conclusion what it has received: but given (and such is our case) wrong affections, wrong tendencies and leanings, as regards the law of duty and life, and then the very fidelity of the understanding perpetuates the error which has vitiated the first propositions that it formed, and, reproducing it at each successive step, establishes it in the conclusion. So that to rely upon those ideas of religion which our nature prompts, because they are sanctioned by our natural understanding would be as absurd as if Euclid should argue a proposition upon a wrong axiom, observing in every step an accurate adherence to that axiom, and a man should allege that accuracy in the subsequent proceeding as a ground for trusting the conclusion, whereas it forms the very demonstration of its falseness. It *cannot* be true."

According to Mr. Gladstone's argument—with which we concur, and on which we ground our resistance to the rationalistic theory—there must be, in every case, an action upon the man independent of his understanding: not because the intel-

lects are weak or dull, but because they have not the principle of faith, without which the word preached will be but as seed scattered on stony ground. The divine word distinctly declares the corruption of our affections, and the incompetency of our unassisted understanding to correct the erroneous impressions made upon it. The Scripture sets forth to us the fulfilment of the will of God as the best and paramount object of desire; but then that same divine will refuses to the natural man the very things he most intensely loves. What natural instinct prompts as desirable, the will of God pronounces to be the reverse. Our affections must be detached from the objects to which they at first and most closely cling, before our understandings can perceive those qualities of excellence in the will of God, without which perception we cannot love to obey it.

"Yet let it not be supposed (urges Mr. Gladstone) that, if this reasoning be admitted, it will have the effect of implying the impotence of the understanding. In truth, this is not really a question between the understanding and some other faculty, but between the rebellious nature of man and Him who created and is now reclaiming it. The man who denies the necessity of spiritual influence in order to the right appreciation of the Christian religion, is not asserting the prerogative of the understanding against the affections. With his views, his understanding will be as much influenced by his affections as the understanding of those who hold an opposite belief would be influenced by their affections. Under cover of asserting the rights and dignity of the understanding, he who thus rationalizes is, in truth, asserting his intention to be governed by his own notions and desires—to make his actual nature the measure and the law of that scheme of religion which avowedly aims at operating a fundamental change in it. And the understanding is not deprived, in the Christian theory, of the office which belongs to it; but fulfils the same office for the rectified and divinely renewed affections as it would have performed for the rebellious and carnal affections."

To clear the mind of rationalistic notions, and even tendencies, is of such pre-eminent importance in preparing it for the profitable reception of Church principles, that we have difficulty in quitting this chapter without further quotations; but that we may find room for a hint on each head of Mr. Gladstone's discussions, we must draw our observations on his masterly refutation of rationalism to a close. To sum up, we may say that rationalism, which is generally taken to be a reference of Christian doctrine to the human understanding as its measure and criterion—a reference of the Gospel to the depraved standard of human nature—is most highly irrational, inasmuch as it relies upon that understanding to determine the state of the

affections, which is itself actually governed by them, in respect to the elementary ideas of religion.

"As, therefore (concludes Mr. Gladstone), it is rationalistic to say Christian doctrine must be true or false, according as it is agreeable or repugnant to our natural perceptions; so also is it rationalistic to trust exclusively to teaching, as an instrument of salvation, or to maintain that intellectual apprehension is a necessary or invariable pre-condition of spiritual agency upon the soul. That as the need and the applicability of divine influences are so large in extent, and embrace so many more persons than possess an active understanding, the rationalism which makes these influences dependent on doctrine only as the medium of their conveyance to men, is exceedingly dangerous to Christianity. That by all these considerations we are prepared to anticipate, in a religion having the wide scope of the Gospel, some distinct provision for the conveyance of grace otherwise than through the understanding, or in connexion with its agency; and some rites or institutions which should both convey grace in this separate and transcendant manner, and likewise mark to the view of men, in the most forcible manner, the distinctness of these channels; and the complex and mystical constitution of all religious ordinances whatever, as consisting of an outward representation or instrumentality, and an inward living power."

Mr. Gladstone's concluding observations on the divine ordinances suggest to us to remark how completely the Catholic Christian—whose religion is that of the heart, not of the head; not that of reason, but of faith—finds embodied in the liturgies of the primitive Church a correct standard both of doctrine and feeling. To show how intimately these are connected together, and, we may add, immediately arising from the topics under consideration, we would refer to the collect for the week anticipating the solemn season of Advent: "Stir up, we humbly beseech thee, O Lord, the wills of thy faithful people." It should always be remembered that the collect which varies with the week and holy-day, and has an epistle and gospel following it, is an integral part of the altar service, having an immediate reference to the venerable eucharist, and the communion of our Lord's most precious body and blood in that adorable mystery. For when such collect is repeated at matins or even-song, it is only by way of memorial, and its meaning must be sought from the service with which it stands in direct connection. "Stir up, we beseech thee, the *wills* of thy faithful people." In whatever way this may be done by a Being of unlimited power, and wisdom, and goodness, we cannot doubt it will be effectually done when he is pleased to take up his abode in our soul, and make our body the shekinah of his glory: for it is then he worketh in us to will and do his good pleasure; and, having taken his seat

on the throne of our affections, will not fail to bring our thoughts into captivity to his will. And in consequence of this indwelling presence of the Lord of Hosts, we shall without fail plenteously bring forth the fruit of good works: it being a certainty that if we abide in Christ Jesus, and he abideth in us, we must bring forth much fruit. Hence we learn that the bodies of the faithful are the temples of the Holy Ghost; that the holy eucharist is the ordinary means of conveying to us the quickening, refreshing, and strengthening virtue of the God-man, Christ Jesus; that from his indwelling presence, all the good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God, must have an accomplishment; and that what he graciously works in us he will abundantly reward to the praise of his name. Here we are taught in what way Jesus Christ is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, redemption, rest, and peace, and joy, even by coming to us and taking up his abode with us, and working in us that which is well pleasing in his sight.

The first Church principle discussed by Mr. Gladstone is that of the visibility of the Church, on which his views are very clear and his propositions sound, and, as they ought to be, diametrically opposed to the Erastian notions of the day. There are too many now, as there have ever been since William of Nassau came among us, who view the Church as founded simply upon the law and will of the State, and as deriving all its authority, and not only its civil rights and temporal jurisdiction, from that source. Sir Robert Peel, in his "Address on the Establishment of a Library and Reading Room at Tamworth"—a discourse which contained no more Christianity than may be found in Cicero's "Tusculan Questions," and not half the sublimity which distinguishes the discussion on the "Nature of the Gods"—actually spoke of the clergy as "public ministers of religion, endowed by the State for the performance of certain duties." We are well aware that Henry VIII. plundered the temporal possessions of the Church, and bestowed them upon the profligate minions whose descendants at Woburn now enjoy them, and in the person of Lord John Russell would apply the portion still remaining to the Church, to any purpose of State expediency; and we are also aware that, of late years, the sovereigns of this realm, less rapacious than Henry, have permitted the Church to retain its possessions; but that the State has ever "endowed" the Church we hear indeed from the member for Tamworth, but utterly deny. Do clergymen, like secretaries of state and poor law commissioners, go quarterly to the Treasury for their salaries? Until they do, pray let us

hear no more of their being "endowed by the State." As well might a highwayman boast that he had presented a traveller with a purse, because he had not taken it. But there are many as well as Sir Robert Peel, on whose lamentable speech we must presently offer a few remarks, who forget the undoubted historical fact, that the Church of Christ had a vital and visible organization of its own as a body, not only independent of, but long antecedent to that of any now existing state with which it is in connection. We do not suppose that Sir Robert Peel, whom we purposely place forwards as the head of the "highly respectables" of the decorous classes—we cannot think that even the repealer of the Test Act, and the enfranchiser of the Irish Papists, exactly regards religion as dependent on civil law; but they certainly seem to consider the religion of individuals as independent of and anterior to the Church. Men of this Erastian mode of mind view the Church, in regard to individuals, as a sort of voluntary combination—a something a little more venerable, perhaps, than the "Library and Reading Room at Tamworth," but still an institution framed at the discretion of existing congregations upon grounds of Christian expediency, dispensing indeed to the people certain truths and ordinances of divine authority, but by a machinery sanctioned by the secular power, the minister of the day, and subject to be varied and removed as a House of Commons may resolve.

But does the character assigned in Holy Scripture to the Church accord with these modern notions? We think not. Throughout the Old Testament, God is pleased to foreshow his elect, not as the sum of a certain number of individuals taken here and there out of the mass, for each of whom he designs and contrives individual salvation; but in their corporate character, either under some single and personal image, as the king's daughter of the Psalms, and the beloved of the Canticles; or under the figure of an object of magnitude, as the mountain; or of a capacity to contain many, as the Lord's house, or the city of Jerusalem. It seems plain to us that the intention of all these diverse kinds of figures is to draw us from our self-regard, and indicate our participation of character and privilege with many brethren. Turn we to the New Testament, and we find the Baptist proclaiming, "the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" and when Christ himself first assumed the ministerial office, he repeated his forerunner's words, and called upon men to repent, "for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." And when, at a subsequent period, he commissioned his disciples to preach in Judea, he bade them, "Go ye and preach, saying

the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Upon St. Peter's confession of faith, our Lord did not promise salvation to every individual making the same, but said that upon this Rock he would build his Church. After his resurrection, and during his abode on earth before his ascension, our Lord's speaking uniformly was of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God. We ask, then, with Mr. Gladstone, how it is that we deem this kingdom of heaven so secondary a representation of our religious life, while in the teaching of our Redeemer it is so prominent?

Mr. Gladstone makes a remark on our Lord's prayer which is striking, and suggests deep meditation with respect to the subject immediately under consideration. Our Lord's directions were, "When thou prayest enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret." But the taught address to be thus preferred in secret, when the solitary worshipper shuns to "be seen of men," is not *my* Father, but *our* Father. It is not in our individual capacity that we worms of earth are to address Him who sitteth on the circle of the heavens with endearing familiarity of expression, but it is by virtue of that bond of grace wherein the whole faithful fold of Christ is embraced.

It is surmised by some that Church principles have a tendency to fill the mind with pride. We think their tendency is in a diametrically contrary direction, and that, in proportion as sodality is substituted for self, humility takes possession of the heart. Man soon grows proud of individual graces, but rarely of the graces and gifts of his brethren. It is in solitude, and not in the congregation, that spiritual pride is engendered and fed. Mr. Gladstone enumerates the five following forms of objection to the principles he advocates:—Firstly, that such an idea of the Church, as a real objective *ens* in the scheme of religion as a portion of divine revelation, tends to abate the reflective sedulity of individual piety. Secondly, that the Church, when placed so prominently in our view, obstructs our contemplation of the Redeemer and our access to him. Thirdly, that it also tends to destroy the singleness of our trust in him, and to introduce unawares that most offensive and most injurious doctrine of human merit. Fourthly, that whereas the wicked in the Church have no title to final salvation, it is a mere fiction to include them in our view of the body of Christ. Fifthly, that it nullifies the liberty of private judgment.

We have not space to follow Mr. Gladstone *seriatim* through his answers to these objections, but we may briefly observe, in reply to the first, that as God has manifestly not chosen to establish his relations with each of us on a distinct and individual footing, but has constituted us in a body to derive from its

source of life a portion of its general life, we need not fear that an ample discharge of one branch of duty should encroach upon another.

And if, according to Aristotle's homely but forcible illustration, in order to make a stick straight we pull it in a contrary direction to its obvious inclination,* so we may remark there is little fear of any extensive deficiency in the regard of the individual to his own welfare; the great difficulty is to induce us to adopt the true way of attaining it, namely, by looking at that higher end which we are bidden and bounden to contemplate, and leaving the result in God's hand. In considering this subject, let us not forget that St. Paul, in his directions to Timothy how to behave himself in the house of God, calls the Church "the pillar and ground of the truth." If the second of the objections above stated had any foundation in fact, it would, indeed, be insuperable; but how those ordinances which ever place our Lord foremost to the believer's view can be said to obstruct his vision of the cross and Calvary, we are totally unable to comprehend. In reply to the third objection, that the frequent performance of our public religious duties has a tendency to foster a self-righteous spirit and vain confidence in human meritoriousness, we would observe that it may be urged, and often is plausibly urged by the profligate, against the performance of any act of virtue or charity at all. A man may grow proud of his almsgiving, his temperance, or his chastity; but are we for fear of this to refrain from deeds of charity and self-denial? Our Lord himself has furnished us with the only answer that man may render to the fourth objection: "Let them both grow together (said he, to his impatient servants) until the harvest; and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn."

This is a mystery which caused holy David's steps well nigh to slip, nor could he approach its apprehension until he "went into the sanctuary of God." It is in the sanctuary alone, and not in the cell of solitude or closet of speculation, that we can learn to wait in patient hope for the hour when the angel shall come forth from the temple, and cry to him that sits on the cloud, "Thrust in thy sickle and reap; for the time is come for thee to reap, for the harvest of the earth is ripe." It was shown to John the divine, that "he that sat upon the cloud thrust in

* "Εις τὸυναντίον δ'ἑαυτὸυς ἀφέλκειν δεῖ· πολὺ γὰρ ἁπαγαγοντες τὸν ἁμαρτανειν εἰς το μέσον, ἥξομενθ· ὅπερὸι τὰ διεσραμμένα τῶν ξλων 'ορθουντες ποιουσιν."—(Eth. Nic. l. 11, c. 9).

his sickle on the earth, and the earth was reaped;" but we must wait until these things shall be. The fifth objection to Church Principles, their interference with the right of private judgment, as the unbridled insolence of modern conceit is called, is, in our opinion, their strongest recommendation. But, in truth, do they preclude or mar the exercise of our reason and judgment? By no means. Scripture directly sanctions the duty, and, as correlative to the duty, the right of a man to assent freely and rationally to the truth. But men in these days are not content with the liberty allowed to enquire; they arrogate to themselves a right to reject alleged truth, if it does not coincide with their own notions. "Search the Scriptures," is Christ's injunction; and the Church of England, in furtherance of her Lord's command, encourages their fullest communication to the people: thereby showing how wholly distinct is the authority she claims for herself from Romish infallibility.

"We have been in an excess (truly remarks Mr. Gladstone) upon the subject of private judgment. Civil society could not be held together were every man to withhold his allegiance from the State until he had been able to make up his mind upon the grounds of the theory of its constitution. Not less injurious is the idea that human beings, growing up from infancy in a Christian land, are not to accept the truths of religion before trial; however it be just that they should be encouraged to try and prove them, in proportion as they arrive at the capacity to do so. And what has been the result of our jealousy? Our impoverishment; our remaining, as it were, conversant only with the alphabet and first elements of religion. Perpetually busied about what is rudimental, from our extreme jealousy of all things except such as (we think) we understand, we do not obey the command of St. Paul to go on unto perfection, and we fail to attain to much of that finished beauty of holiness which is perceived in its accurate and full development. Surely it shall be better when we accept with more of trust and thankfulness those great truths which are of our patrimony as members of the Church, and when the superfluous portion of that energy which is now absorbed by the active jealousy of private judgment shall be more worthily bestowed in accumulating new treasures of stable divine knowledge, to the end that we may be more thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

We consider the doctrine of the Church, as proposed by the authority of Scripture and prescribed by our own apostolic Mother, to have a direct practical tendency to bring us nearer to God; and by realizing and making clearer that way of access which is revealed to us, and not suffering us to hang upon the Redeemer through the frailty of any merely intellectual medium, but by attaching us to him by a vital incorporation, we conceive it best accomplishes the great and sacred purposes of the Gos-

pel. Clouds will rest at times upon the most pious and gifted mind, and hide all heaven from its view; but upon the mountain of God's help eternal sunshine settles. The answer to prayer is oftener found in the declarations of the creeds than in the individual's own single impression upon the subject of his petition; and no mere body of propositions, however holy and excellent, can sustain the heart, like a belief that we are incorporated into that Church, are portions of that Rock against which the powers of darkness and of evil, the gates of hell, shall not prevail. The individual man stands in a lower position than that which belongs to him in the Church as a part of her incorporate life. Man, as an individual, cannot be so assured of his being wedded to Christ as is the Church of her mystical and indissoluble relations with him; and therefore, precious as is the privilege of access to his Lord allowed to man in secret, more elevated is he in public worship, and he may rely, as a member of Christ's Church, for a continuance of his favour, and a derivation of vital graces from him, with a degree of confidence which is safe for the body, but for the individual would be unsafe and destructive of sobriety. So far, then, from these Church principles encouraging individual pride, the force of self-love is by them broken and dissipated. Mr. Gladstone draws a very beautiful illustration of this abnegation of self from a familiar fact, but one on which we do not remember ever to have read such pertinent remarks:—

"It has been observed, as a circumstance full of meaning, that no man knows the names of the architects of our cathedrals. They left no record of their names upon the fabrics, as if they would have nothing there that could suggest any other idea than the glory of that God to whom the edifices were devoted for perpetual and solemn worship—nothing to mingle a meaner association with the profound sense of his presence; or as if, in the joy of having built him a house, there was no want left unfulfilled, no room for the question whether it is good for a man to live in posthumous renown. But come (Mr. Gladstone continues) to the mean and petty reconstructions of the interiors of our parochial churches which have been effected within the last hundred years, and we find that they are bedaubed, even if the achievement be no more than the building a gallery, with the names at length, and often in a position of most indecent prominence, of those, not whose imaginations devised the work, not whose hands fashioned it, not whose offerings bore the cost, but such as have held some temporary parochial office—as have been, for the year of unsightly work, some *Fidenarum Gabiorumque potestas;* and thus have been enabled to gratify their vanity in the temple of God. But it was the fault of an evil time."

One signal, we had nearly written, and will write, flagrant ex-

ception to the above rule, with reference to our cathedrals, will probably, on the instant, occur to most of our readers—and that is the pompous inscription engraven on high in St. Paul's. It is there ostentatiously written in marble that the huge pile is the monument of its architect. We all know that to the memory of Wren the bad taste of an Erastian age offered this tribute. But who built Westminster Abbey, and Our Lady's Chapel in Southwark? And in which building do we more immediately think of Him to whose service it is dedicated? Do not our thoughts, as it were instinctively, turn heavenwards so soon as we enter the long drawn aisles and look upwards to the fretted vaults of Westminster? But who that ever visited the *Halle au Blé* at Paris, can fail to be reminded of it when he looks around him at St. Paul's? For ourselves, we confess that, in spite of our efforts to expel such unseasonable imaginings, we never cross St. Paul's without thinking what an admirable corn-mart it would make, and can never select for it a higher purpose than that of a national gallery, dedicated to the memory of illustrious statesmen, gallant admirals, and doughty field marshals. We cannot even think of poets, and never look at Samuel Johnson in the character of Hercules without being almost as indignant at the H. B., the caricaturing image-maker, who put such a slight upon the sage of Lichfield, as probably was the Grecian hero himself, when doomed to twirl Omphale's distaff. We venture to think that Mr. Gladstone will concur with our notions on this head if he ever sees these remarks; and sincerely do we concur with him in his dislike of the heathen ornaments and odious flattery that desecrated all our churches for the last few generations, but which, happily, the present age evinces an increasing disposition to discontinue.

"There is a simple and striking proof of the extent to which a general secularity had encroached upon the Church, in the ordinary tone of those monumental inscriptions which deface the walls of many of our sacred edifices. It is extremely painful to see, on every hand, in almost every church, records of social respectability, of domestic affection, of professional talent, of scientific acquirement, of martial valour, in one instance which has met my eye, even of distinction in freemasonry, without any accompanying notice of the Christian hopes of the deceased, and of that character by virtue of which alone their human qualities can justly claim either permanence or praise. What respect has the stern sceptre of death for these earthly shows? What title have they to be commemorated amidst the solemnities of the Christian temple, unless they be under the seal of Christ? Gladdening it is in the galleries of the Vatican, walled with the sepulchral inscriptions of antiquity, to pass from those cheerless memorials of the dead, which alone paganism could supply, to the emphatic phrases

and the not less eloquent symbols which marked the tombstones of the early Christians, and told of their present peace and joyful anticipations of the future; but how sad that we should now recoil from the use of our free privileges, and speak, as is so often the case, of the dead in Christ, as though immortality was not yet brought to light."

If any of our readers think we dwell at undue length on what may seem, at first blush, subjects of a subordinate character, we beg to remind them that these minor matters afford the least fallible *indicia* of the tone of national temper and manners. It is in a man's unguarded moments that an acute observer discerns his real character; and the case is the same with a nation as with the individual men of which it is composed. But we have a chain of direct testimony to show how almost entirely the pressure of high Christian motives was removed from the national heart and mind of this country during the whole of the last century. And let it be noted by those who hastily conclude that errors of doctrine are of no moment so long as virtuous conduct is preserved—

> "For modes of faith let senseless zealots fight—
> His can't be wrong whose life is in the right;"

let the admirers of this flippant and flagitious couplet observe, that the corruption and decay of Church principles were closely connected with and proceeded downwards together with the corruption and decay of personal piety. Mr. Gladstone quotes from a letter addressed to the pious Doddridge, in 1739, on occasion of the debate respecting the repeal of the Test Act, the following awfully profane passage:—

> "Mr. Danvers said, in his usual jocular way, that it was a *ceremony* to take off one's hat upon going into a church, which nobody, however, scrupled to comply with; and that he could not comprehend why people made any scruple about eating and drinking with one another in the same place, which is just such another ceremony."

Doddridge's correspondent seems quite unconscious that there was anything worse than jocularity in Danvers's remark, or any thing to outrage the feelings of the sincerely pious individual he was addressing. We do not forget that Doddridge was a Dissenter, and opposed to the Test Act; but that any correspondent of so venerable a Christian should venture to repeat, without the slightest token of disapprobation, a speech of such indecent levity, with reference to the Lord's Supper, is surely a strong indication of the low tone of religious feeling in those days. A few years earlier, in the same century, Bishop Burnet, in the preface to his "Pastoral Care," thus writes:—

> "I cannot look on without the deepest concern, when I see the

imminent ruin hanging over this Church, and, by consequence, over the whole Reformation. The outward state of things is black enough, God knows; but that which heightens my fears rises chiefly from the inward state into which we are unhappily fallen."

In 1728, Bishop Gibson, in his "Pastoral Letters," complains that "profaneness and impiety are grown bold and open;" and in 1730, Dr. Calamy wrote—"A real decay of serious religion, both in the Church and out of it, was very visible." Bishop Butler, in 1736, observes:—

"It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted, by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of enquiry, but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious; and accordingly they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment, and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world."

Two years later, Archbishop Secker writes:—

"An open and professed disregard to religion is become, through a variety of unhappy causes, the distinguishing character of the present age. This evil is grown to a great height in the metropolis of the nation; is daily spreading through every part of it; and, bad in itself as any can be, must of necessity bring in all others after it. Indeed, it hath already brought in such dissoluteness and contempt of principle in the highest part of the world, and such profligate intemperance and fearlessness of committing crimes in the lower, as must, if this torrent of impiety stop not, become absolutely fatal: and God knows, far from stopping, it receives, through the ill designs of some persons and the inconsiderateness of others, a continual increase. Christianity is now ridiculed and railed at with very little reserve, and the teachers of it without any at all. The consequence hath been, as it naturally must, that disregard to us hath greatly increased the disregard to public worship and instruction; that many are grown prejudiced against religion—nay, more, indifferent about it and unacquainted with it."

Archbishop Secker's charges comprehend the period from 1738 to 1766, and they exhibit an uniform but most melancholy picture of the joint decay of both discipline and doctrine.

Bishop Horne complained, in 1756, in the following strain:—

"It is the complaint of hundreds of serious and pious Christians that there is at present not only a lamentable relaxation of discipline in the Church, but (what is, indeed, the consequence of it) as lamentable a falling off from the old way of preaching and expounding the word of God. Let any one read the sermons of the primitive fathers, and our divines that lived in the times succeeding the Reformation, who preached from the fathers, as the fathers did from the Scriptures, and compare their discourses with those of this last century, and they

must pronounce one or other of them to be many removes from Christianity."

If we turn from the Church to the Dissenters we find them drawing the same picture of the low and languid state of religion during the dreary period in question, on which we especially dwell, as illustrating the intimate and inalienable connection between doctrine and practice, which it was so long the fashion to deride, to deny, or disregard. The "Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism," a volume published in 1839 by the representatives of that body, thus speaks of the early part of the last century:—

"It was unquestionably the most unevangelical period that had ever occurred in this country since the Reformation was completed, in the reign of Elizabeth. Infidelity was extremely prevalent, both in the form of downright blasphemy and of philosophical speculation. Strenuous efforts were also then made, by several ecclesiastics, to introduce deadly heresy into the Church of God."

Hoadly instantly occurs to our memory; but how mournful is it to read, from the pen of a man in many respects so excellent as Paley, such a passage as the following, which we quote from a visitation sermon delivered in 1777. After enumerating many of the phrases and passages of Scripture which relate to the new birth and new life of Christians, Paley, then an archdeacon, observes, that it has frequently been asked what such expressions mean? "To which we answer, nothing; nothing, that is, to us; nothing to be found or sought for in the present circumstances of Christianity." A much respected Cambridge friend not long ago charged us with undue severity for pronouncing Paley's philosophy sophistical and sensual: the above passage was not then present to our mind, or we should have cited it as an additional justification of our jealousy of the writings of one who is so fondly cherished on the banks of the Cam. Another Cambridge friend about the same time derided our confessed partiality for the works of Aristotle, and said that he and Paley, as philosophers, were not to be named on the same day. We quietly replied, they were not.

But to resume. During this deplorable period of decline of doctrine and practice, there was a decay of theological learning also. Bishop Warburton says, "Learning is—in the southern parts, at least, of this island—fast on the decline. Ignorance and barbarism are making large strides." A more courtly and courteous complainant, Bishop Burnett, observed, in 1713:—

"The much greater part of those who come to be ordained are ignorant to a degree not to be apprehended by those who are not obliged

to know it. The easiest part of knowledge is that to which they are the greatest strangers—I mean the plainest part of the Scriptures; which, they say, in excuse for their ignorance, that their tutors in the universities never mention the reading of to them. Many, having got into orders, come for institution, and cannot make it appear that they have read the Scriptures, or any one good book, since they were ordained."

Painful has been the contemplation of this dreary scene—most painful to us to record the degraded condition of the Anglican Church, while the notions that doctrine had no direct bearing upon practice, and learning was useless, were prevalent. Let us mark the approach of a happier time. Serious and earnest men arose, and, appalled with the destruction of souls around them, implied by the personal impurity and vice predominant on all sides, inculcated, to arouse men from their slumbers, those doctrines which most directly bear on personal salvation. The fall of man, the atonement, justification by faith, sanctification by the Holy Spirit, were the momentous and soul-stirring truths announced to excited thousands by the Wesleys, the Newtons, the Cecils, the Scotts, the Milners, of the age. Devoting their utmost energies to the enforcement of doctrines bearing on the personal acceptance of those whom they exhorted, they were little disposed to pay regard to the powers and privileges of the visible Church, the assertion of whose claims and the exercise of whose powers they, in their day, too frequently saw associated with personal lukewarmness and gross administrative abuses. "Repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ," the elementary truths of the Gospel, were the awakening verities proclaimed amidst the dead in trespasses and sins. With these vital doctrines many strange and unauthorized admixtures were made. Mr. Gladstone points to John Wesley's notions on the subjects of perfection and assurance, and the tenets of reprobation held by the school of Toplady and Berridge. But every year that has passed away since the concluding portion of the last century has been marked by a modification in the tone of teaching adopted even by preachers who profess themselves disciples of the Romaines, and Robinsons, and Scotts; while the doctrines of Catholic consent, of grace in the sacraments, of succession in the ministry, of visibility in the Church, now deeply and widely pervade the general mind of the English Church. The last twenty years, and particularly the last ten, have witnessed a resolute and remarkable inculcation of Church principles; and, as Mr. Gladstone aptly observes, "this resuscitation has precisely, and in due order, retraced the path of decline." The doctrines of the study and the discourses of the pulpit declined

with the decay of Church principles, and now the reinvigoration of the former seems to be congenially followed by a resumption of the latter.

"And so (remarks Mr. Gladstone) it was in the course of nature that the order of progress should be. As long as zeal was rare, and its objects isolated, the merely personal principles of religion might tolerably suffice; but when masses have began to kindle, and the Church at large again to brace herself for her work, then zeal, in order to the maintenance of unity, and in order to permanency of results, absolutely requires to be embodied in that organization which Church principles alone can supply.....If it be said (continues Mr. Gladstone) there is this opinion about prayers for the dead, and that opinion about sin after baptism, connected with the inculcation of the principles of Church authority; and one writer has depreciated the characters of the reformers, and another has made unwritten tradition a part of the rule of faith; the answer is easy: these are accessory and collateral matters to be tried on their own merits, and in cool blood, not to be rejected in the mass and without examination, far less to be allowed to drag down with them other principles, such as that of the apostolical succession and of Catholic consent, which are positively maintained and acted upon by our Church; that is to say, asserted in her unrepealed formularies, and realized in the daily and unvarying practice of her rulers. And let us suppose that these opinions of particular individuals *are* examined, and that they fail to abide the test; that they *are* consequently exploded, one, or most, or all. What then? They would but be exhibited to our view as the dross, without which, in this poor world, the pure ore is not to be obtained. They would but complete the analogy between the present efforts for the fuller recognition of Church principles, and the counterpart which we have found for them in efforts of the last century, to bring out into the clearer consciousness of Christian men the necessity of a new and spiritual life. Every powerful reaction, unless under a guidance absolutely inspired, must necessarily bring its excesses, its idiosyncrasies, its accretions; that first reaction abounded in them, yet brought us a vast preponderance of spiritual good; must we not expect now again to find, that human infirmity is not altogether expelled from the thoughts, the tempers, and the language of men?"

A very common but erroneous opinion prevails, that the teaching of the doctrines we comprise under the head Church Principles is peculiar, in the present day, to certain unquestionably pious and learned individuals in the University of Oxford. Mr. Gladstone endeavours to correct this notion, by giving, in an appendix, a series of quotations from writers, both clerical and lay, who have not the most remote connection with the Oxford Tractarians; nay, who have some of them written and spoken against the "Tracts for the Times." The testimonies adduced by Mr. Gladstone clearly prove how unjustly the car-

dinal principles of our Church polity are confounded with the particular and private opinions of any teachers. He cites the testimonies of nine of our bishops, the most remote being Heber; also of Faber, Selwyn, Tyler, Melvill, Maurice, and others whose names suggest to our memory actual censure and frequent opposition to much that has been propounded in the Tracts. We have ourselves condemned, as indiscreet, many of the series, and wish the writers would desist from their further publication. But having said thus much, having expressed our doubts of the Christian prudence of sending forth, to an undiscerning public, more of these particular Tracts, we do not hesitate to avow our conviction, that extensive and permanent good has been wrought by their influence. We advisedly repeat, by their influence—for many a man has been by them convinced of the paramount necessity of stricter holiness of life than even the decent and orderly have been wont to cultivate of late years, has been taught to prize more intensely the best gifts of God in his Church, has been turned back to the old ways, and led to walk in the paths of a simpler and a holier generation; and yet he, perchance, has been one offended by the arrogance of a deceased Tract writer, and the hard doctrine upon sin after baptism inculcated by an austere living one. Those are destitute of the smallest share of discrimination who cannot perceive the possibility of good being wrought by books, with every proposition of which all men cannot concur. Such, in our opinion, has eminently been the case with the "Tracts for the Times," and verily their authors shall not lose their reward; but now we think they have discharged their office, the trumpet has given a certain sound, and the army of the faithful has made itself ready for the battle. Among the beneficial effects of the spirit that has been stirred in Oxford—though let it not be forgotten that Dr. Turton and the present Bishop of Lincoln, at Cambridge, directed attention to the fathers and early ecclesiastical history years before a single Tract had been published—among the good effects, we reckon the revival of a taste for old divinity, and the republication of the racy writings of our elder worthies. Mr. Melvill, in his preface to a recent edition of Sherlock's "Discourse of Public Assemblies," has put the advantages attending the republication of such works, in preference to the embodying the same sentiments in any new book, in a very clear point of view:—

"Men will commonly hearken (says Mr. Melvill) with less prejudice to the dead than to the living: opinions which they would reject at once, if advanced by one of their contemporaries, secure something of an audience when produced from old authors whose names are held

in general respect. There are undoubtedly many things alleged in the following treatise which will prove unpalatable in no common degree; and though the writer of this notice is thoroughly persuaded of their truth, and anxious to gain for them currency, he feels they would have but little chance of being duly examined and weighed, were they put forth by any author of the day. Perhaps they may fare better when thus brought, so to speak, from the grave, and published in the name of one long withdrawn from this scene of contention and trial."

Now we have the book open before us we cannot refrain from quoting the following passage, strictly pertinent to those Church principles which we advocate, embodying, be it remembered, the sentiments of one of the most powerful and popular preachers of the day—one of the brightest ornaments of that pulpit he so properly postpones to the altar:—

"The Dissenter will be indignant at finding himself treated as a schismatic, and his schism represented as alike perilous and inexcusable. But these are not times for disguising and varnishing error. The Church, rudely assailed, threatened with the loss of the patronage of the State, has need to examine and assert her apostolical character. She is not one among sects and denominations; and it behoves her, though with as much of tenderness as firmness, to maintain and manifest the authority derived to her from her Head—an authority which, as no human legislature could give, neither can any human legislature destroy; and which renders it sin to separate from her communion, so long as it cannot be proved to be sin to remain in it. Of course, we shall immediately be told of the concientiousness of Dissent; but on this point we gladly refer—expecting no audience ourselves, in days when Churchmanship is thought identical with the worst bigotry—to the statements of Sherlock, in chap. iii., section 1: we shall only say, that it is easy to mistake prejudice or fancy for conscience; but that there is an end of all government and authority, if conscience is first to be admitted as supreme, and then every man is to make the rule of conscience for himself.

"But it is not the Dissenter alone who will find unpalatable truths in the following discourse. The Churchman will meet with much that is opposed to popular opinion and practice. They who would shrink from being schismatics in the aggravated sense of separating from Church communion, think nothing, for the most part, of being schismatics in a lesser, but an actual sense—that of separation from parochial communion. This matter is treated with great delicacy and faithfulness in part ii., chap. 1, of Sherlock's Discourse; and the temper of the times renders it specially needful that attention should be directed towards it. If a minister wish now-a-days to advance 'a hard saying,' one which will excite a more than common outcry, let him tell the multitude which is running hither and thither after preachers, that it is their duty, and would be vastly for their benefit, to be content with the instruction provided for each by his own parochial ministers. Yet, if there be a truth, this, we believe, is one. The whole ordinance of an Established

Church appears set at nought, if every man is to choose his own teachers, though teachers have been assigned to him by competent authority. The distribution of instructors cannot be regarded as a mere thing of chance by any one who acknowledges in Christ the Head and 'Minister of the sanctuary.' Rather must it be considered that Christ has to do with the assignment to every parish of its spiritual pastors, either appointing such as will be faithful to their calling, or permitting the appointment of others, because designing to overrule for good their failings and faults. And if it be said that there is no sufficient evidence of the excellence of the parochial economy, as thus understood and asserted, let it be answered that there is no sufficient trial; every man looks out for his own instructor, tries church after church till he has found one to his taste, and then settles himself for just so long as he may relish the provided instruction.

"Can this be a wholesome, a right state of things—a state in which the ordinance of God is virtually superseded, and the sheep wander to and fro in quest of a shepherd, not because no shepherd has been given them, but because they wish to meet with one who shall be better than their own? Indeed we all know what answer will be made. Our own shepherd does not lead us to green pastures; he teaches error: are we to listen to error, when elsewhere we may find truth? This is a melancholy answer; for it is too often based upon fact. We may not deny—would to God we could!—that the statements of the Gospel heard in our churches are occasionally crude and imperfect. But there is no sufficient reason in this for abandoning the parochial ministrations. It must be an extreme case which justifies separation, whether from the Church to which we belong, or from the portion of that Church in which we are parochially placed. The prayers and the sacraments remain in their beauty and energy, when the sermons may be defective. And it were well if men would more bear in mind, that it ought not to be for the preaching alone, nor even chiefly, that they go up to God's house: that house is 'a house of prayer,' though, alas! it is deserted almost as a matter of course whensoever it is opened for nothing but prayer.

"Besides, even so far as the preaching is concerned, a man is immeasurably more likely to be benefited by meekly submitting himself to an ordinance, though imperfectly administered, than by constituting himself judge of the mode of administration, and refusing to attend unless his own standard be reached. The temper in which a sermon is heard has commonly more to do with its profitableness to the soul than the doctrine on which it insists. God may be expected to bless those most who use with most simplicity the appointed means of grace; and therefore are the ministrations of the parochial clergy, if attended by the parishioners on the principle that these men are their authorised teachers, far more likely to promote growth in knowledge and grace than those of any other clergy, however more eminent in learning, eloquence, or piety. Alas, that a truth, which ought to be self-evident to all who recognise God's institutions in the visible Church, should be almost utterly lost sight of! When the sermons are not what professors of religion think they should be, the church is abandoned; the

minister, whose power to instruct depends much on the prayers of his people, is forsaken by all but the careless and indifferent; and the deserters suppose that they have given their faithful testimony against error, when they have done their best to perpetuate it in their parish."

This declaration of his sentiments by Mr. Melvill is as contrary to the popular system of the day, miscalled evangelical, as almost anything contained in the "Tracts for the Times;" that modern system which partakes so much of the character of our own age of expediency, which is mostly founded on feeling, and not on the sacraments, not on divinely appointed ordinances; which does not consist in liturgical services, not in prayer, not in obedience—but in words and phrases, in professions and emotions, in popular appeals and party zeal, in a preference of the platform to the pavement of the temple, in confounding all distinctions between the Church of God and all the sects which prevail among misguided men, and—alas! that we should have so to sum up—which dares to regard this indifference to divisions as a sign of spirituality of mind. According to St. Paul, divisions indicate a carnal spirit: "For ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions—are ye not carnal?"

Well are we aware that a cry has been raised against those who have been active in promoting a recurrence to primitive principles, as if they were sowers of dissension and guilty of heresy. In familiar life has it not been the lot of all of us to witness, that when one or two of a party have refused to join in some wild frolic they have been immediately pronounced unpleasant, spoilers of sport, wet blankets, kill-joys? But were the heedless majority, or the reviled few, in the right? Our simile is a low one, perhaps, but does it not illustrate the position of the few who are faithful found in a faithless age, the teachers of those Church principles which may be traced, from century to century, up to the age of martyrs and of fathers, to the age of the apostles, and, finally, to the text of those holy Scriptures from which they derive their origin; for it is only as they are derivable from the word of God, only as they may be safely regarded as the means of obtaining and continuing in God's favour during our abode on earth, and of being accepted of him for the sake of Jesus Christ at last, and escaping the dreadful doom of the impenitent, that we tender these principles at all. In any other point of view they are of no more worth than the idle and unprofitable speculations of the day—theories to kindle the imagination, or touch the fancy, or gratify a busy and craving curiosity; but inefficacious to abate the worldly pride of the heart and amend the life. But the practical tendency of

the doctrines enforced by those who seek the revival of apostolical order is abundantly manifested by the restoration of many practices prescribed of old by the Church, which had, until a very recent period, become obsolete with almost all her members.

A more striking proof of the decay of primitive piety, and neglect of holy living, cannot be given than the surprise excited when a few anonymous Tracts, published without ostentation, recommended the observance of the fasts and festivals of the Church, a more frequent communion, a daily attendance on divine worship, and other practices, every one of which may be read in the rubrics of our Common Prayer Books. What ignorance of all that the first Christians reckoned a devout imitation of their Lord, had come upon this nation, when fasting was called Popish, and bowing at the name of Jesus, and turning our faces to the east when we confess our faith, derided as superstition. What a departure has taken place from the pious usages of those days, when, as Tertullian wrote ages before Popery existed, Christians were wont to carry about with them everywhere the sign of the cross.

"At every step and every movement, going out and coming in, dressing and putting on their sandals, at the bath, at the board, when lamps were lighted, when they lay down to rest, when they seated themselves for their daily task, whatever call of ordinary life engaged them, the holy sign, by incessant use, was, as it were, worn into their foreheads."

The anger excited by these doctrines, and the rancorous animosity with which their promulgators have been assailed, is to our minds the most convincing proof how much this generation stands in need of them. If a recommendation, founded on the authority of the Church, to fast at certain stated seasons, and to an extent not detrimental to health, is so offensive as to subject the reverend adviser to an imputation of Romanism, how self-indulgent and pampered have men become, and how meet is it that self-denial and the mortification of the flesh should be inculcated as duties. When men stubbornly refuse to yield their assent to anything but what their natural reason can comprehend, is it not high time to tell them that by obedience only can they obtain knowledge? When men and women go to church to have their minds gratified, and their feelings excited by a preacher, rather than to engage in humble prayer, is it not well for them to be reminded that it is not by excellency of speech, or man's wisdom, that salvation must be won?

Many oppose these doctrines because they are antithetical to the spirit of the age, and argue that they are therefore

unsuited for it. We take this very ground as the foundation of our argument in their favour. Medicaments were formerly, before homæopathy was in fashion, and probably still are, mostly of an opposite character to the disease for which they were administered: stimulants were applied to the paralytic, cooling drinks to the feverish. In moral curative processes the ancient medical practice must prevail. The self-willed must be made to bow to authority, the self-indulgent must be mortified, the impatient must learn to wait, those who require to see, and touch, and handle, must be taught to walk by faith, and not by sight. For the peculiar disorders of the present age we can discern no effective cure, but in a recurrence to the primitive practices of a better-ordered piety than has of late prevailed; and if men urge they have not time to frequent the house of prayer, as did their forefathers, and are too enlightened to need superstitious aids to devotion, we plainly tell them that they must then take this world as their portion, and be prepared, all illuminated as they believe themselves to be, to dwell in darkness for ever. Why must men be daily reminded that God has a claim to our whole existence, and that every act performed in a state of mind not recognizing that claim is virtually an act of rebellion against the Almighty, and goes to form the habit of alienation within us? But has this plea of want of leisure to perform such public religious duties as the Church ordains, any validity? None whatever, even when urged by the most occupied; and we believe that there is daily less and less inclination to make this excuse. Let us take the instance of daily morning and evening prayers in our parish churches. The rubric prescribes that "all priests and deacons are to say *daily* the morning and evening prayer, either *privately* or openly, not being let by sickness, or some other urgent cause. And the curate that ministereth in every parish church or chapel, being at home, and not being reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the parish church or chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's word, and to pray with him." So far as the clergy are concerned, nothing is more clear than that they are commanded by the Church *daily* to say her services, whether the people will hear or whether they will forbear. In a charge delivered to his clergy in 1685, Bishop Fell gives advice that may be profitably considered in the present day:—

"If I require a constant diligence in offering the daily sacrifice of prayer for the people, at least at those returns which the Church enjoins, the usual answer is, they are ready to do their duty, but the

people will not be prevailed with to join them. And so when the minister has thoroughly accused his flock, he thinks he has absolved himself; his church becomes a sinecure: and because others forbear to do their duty, there remains none for him to do. But, my brethren (continues the good bishop), if our people be negligent, we are the more obliged to industry; if they are indevout, we ought to be more zealous; if they are licentious, we ought to be more exemplary. Nor let any man say the people will not be prevailed upon. How know we what will be hereafter? They who resisted one attempt may yield unto another; or if they yield not to a single instance, they may to many and more pressing."

Our own experience enables us to say that, in the present day, the minister will not lack a congregation if convenient hours, early in the morning and rather late in the evening, are appointed. Eleven in the forenoon and three in the afternoon, of course, can only suit those comparatively unoccupied by worldly business; they quite exclude the working man. In places where the experiment has been tried it has been blessed with success. And let not the affluent imagine that the poor working man or woman will not come to church before the commencement or after the close of their daily toil: many and many a weary one will come to the house of prayer for refreshment, if it is only open for them. How often upon the continent have we sighed when we saw a poor peasant stop his cart opposite a church, and enter in to say his prayers, and then resume his laborious way; how often have we sighed under the remembrance that our own poor had no such facility for worship afforded them. There are bold and ultra Protestants who will say, of what avail are prayers offered up under the circumstances we allude to; and will arrogantly assume that it is better to be silent than so to pray. We dare not pass such condemnation upon a worshipper who thus prays with a humble heart, though it may be with a clouded understanding; such censure seems to us to savour of presumptuous sin. Where two or three are gathered together in his name, our Lord has promised to be in the midst of them. What profane and inconsiderate levity is there, then, in the talk about empty benches, or the unkind sneer at reading prayers to half-a-dozen old women. Those of our clerical brethren in the country who do not sneer, but are averse to reading daily prayers in church for want of a congregation, should remember they may have the members of their own household, and, by the example of pious Herbert, may be encouraged to hope to gather, in time, more worshippers. The picture which Isaac Walton draws is so touchingly beautiful that we cannot refrain from transcribing it, though it may be familiar to a majority of our readers:—

"Mr. Herbert's own practice was to appear constantly, with his wife and three nieces (the daughters of a deceased sister), and his whole family, twice every day at the church prayers, in the chapel which does almost join to his parsonage house. And for the time of his appearing it was strictly at the canonical hours of ten and four, and then and there he lifted up pure and charitable hands to God in the midst of the congregation. And he would joy to have spent that time in that place, where the honour of his Master, Jesus, dwelleth: and there, by that inward devotion which he testified constantly by an humble behaviour and visible adoration, he, like Joshua, brought not only 'his own household thus to serve the Lord,' but brought most of his parishioners, and many gentlemen in the neighbourhood, constantly to make a part of his congregation twice a day; and some of the meaner sort of his parish did so love and reverence Mr. Herbert, that they would let their plough rest when Mr. Herbert's saint's bell rung to prayers, that they might also offer their devotions to God with him, and would then return back to their plough. And his most holy life was such, that it begat such reverence to God, and to him, that they thought themselves the happier when they carried Mr. Herbert's blessing back with them to their labour. Thus powerful was his reason and his example to persuade others to a practical piety and devotion."

"Be not discouraged (writes Bishop Ken, in his 'Pastoral Letter to his Clergy') if but few come to the solemn assemblies, but go to the house of prayer, where God is well known for a sure refuge; go, though you go alone, or with one besides yourself; and there, as you are God's remembrancer, keep not silence, and give him no rest, till he establish, till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth."

We are fully sensible how strange to many these recommendations will sound—how useless, how inexpedient they will seem to others; but we firmly believe the principles they involve have sank, and will sink deeper, into many hearts; they have shot their roots downward, and, like the young trees of Paradise, will, in due season and at the appointed time, bear fruit upwards. Difficulties of no ordinary magnitude and number no doubt oppose themselves, and success may be extremely partial, but the labour is sweet in its progress, and glorious in its final result. For—

"If now (to quote Mr. Gladstone's own glowing words) we wander in the cloud, and if we cannot at every step convince one another with clear vision, and attain to a perfect harmony of movement, yet one day the breeze of heaven will bear that cloud away from the mountain on which we stand, the mountain of the Lord's house: then it will be seen, too sharply for evasion or for doubt, that truth is positive, invariable, and one; and that God had a certain fixed medium for his revelation, and for her conveyance to our human perceptions; and that some received her and some received her not; and that of those who received her, some did it with more and some with

less of strength and distinctness, some with more and some with less of corrupt admixture; some undervaluing her essence, some strangely combining with her lucid shape the hideous and but half-disguised forms of unrighteousness; some, through holy trust and self-abandonment, enabled to yield up their whole souls to her firm and gentle rule. And will it not then be a glorious prize to be found among those who shall come nearest, were it but by one degree, to that full essence of the holy faith in which the Redeemer taught it, and which will naturally and generally be found to be combined with the nearest degree of conformity in the affections to his image? Doubtless, if to appreciate the use of the understanding were to undervalue that deeper science of the affections—if there were any incompatibility, any even the slightest opposition between the exercise of the one and of the other, we should do well to forego even the intellectual discipline, rather than dry up the living fountains of the heart: but yet reason is a genuine and glorious gift, and an instrument of the highest order for the attainment of truth; and there is no natural opposition, but a natural concord, between the exercise of reason and the growth of the affections; and the true progress of a man is dependent in great measure on that union. Surely, then, it is best for us to dedicate and devote, according to the measure of our means, the whole man, with all his faculties, to this ennobling labour in the deep rich mine. To this task of pressing towards the mark for the prize—to this high contention of the brotherhood of love, where the victory of one is not the defeat of another, but where every competitor may be a conqueror, where it is difficult for any man to advance in grace himself without also helping his brother onward, and wherein every distinction once earned, however small it may now appear to the eye of flesh, shall remain visibly and eternally glorious, when those petty spaces which separate the gradations of earthly magnitude and minuteness shall have waned into pale insignificance."

How unjust is the charge of austerity, moroseness, monkish inactivity, bigotry, and want of brotherly love, brought against Church principles by the latitudinarians of the day! And yet so little are these principles understood, so indistinct are men's views of their tendency, that in a very respectable periodical we lately saw Mr. Gladstone and Daniel O'Connell placed in juxtaposition. "Such men (writes the Reviewer) as Mr. Gladstone and Mr. O'Connell." Truly, this age, so wise in its own conceit, has much to learn. Sir Robert Peel, in the speech at Tamworth, to which we have already adverted, told his auditors that a knowledge of science would cheer and support them in the dark hour of adversity, and afford them consolation on the bed of death. Cicero has said as much centuries ago, but with infinitely more feeling and grace than Sir Robert Peel, whose stilted condescension and strained civility to his neighbours must have been repulsive to many, and ludicrous to all.

Do even the tanners of Tamworth, one of which class sought to outwit Edward IV., need Sir Robert Peel's assurance, in the reign of Queen Victoria, that "the heights of science are not closed to the humblest?" But Sir Robert himself seems to have forgotten the lessons he learned at Oxford, for in that common text-book there, the "Nichomachean Ethics," Aristotle very clearly and repeatedly lays it down that the perception of moral truth depends not on the intellect, but the moral life; knowledge has little to do with the matter:—"*πρὸς τὸ τὰς ἀρετὰς, τὸ μὲν εἰδέναι μικρὸν ἢ οὐδὲν ἰσχύει*"—(b. ii. c. 4). Aristotle insisted that vice destroys the very faculty of discerning moral truth, while no amount of vicious indulgence prevents the apprehension and appreciation of scientific truth, to which Sir Robert alone invited the attention of his audience; for from the Tamworth Library "everything calculated to excite religious or political animosity shall be excluded:" and an exclusion of everything offensive to Socialists and Socinians, we apprehend, would shut out most moral and religious books.

"*Οὐ γὰρ πᾶσαν ὑπόληψιν* (says the Stagyrite) *διαφθείρει, οὐδὲ διαστρέφει τὸ ἡδὺ, καὶ τὸ λυπηρον, ὅιον, ὅτι τὸ τριγωνον δυσὶν ορθαῖς ἴσας ἔχει, ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἀλλὰ τὰς περὶ τὸ πρακτόν. Αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀρχὰι τῶν πρακτῶν, τὸ οὗ ἕνεκα τὰ πρακτά· τῷ δὲ διαφθαρμένῳ δι' ἡδονήν, ἡ λύπην εὐθὺς οὐ φανεῖται ἡ ἀρχὴ, οὐδὲ δεῖν τούτου ἕνεκα, 'ιδὲ διὰ τοῦθ' αἱρεῖσθαι πάντα καὶ πράττειν, ἕξι γαρ ἡ κακία φθαρτικὴ ἀρχῆς*"—(b. vi. c. 5).

A man must be brought up well, says Aristotle again and again—must from childhood be taught with what to be pleased and displeased—to understand even, much less to practise, morals.

"*Διὸ δεῖ ἦχθάι πως εὐθὺς ἐκ νέων, ὡς ὁ Πλάτων φησὶν, ὡςε χάιρειν τε καὶ λυπεῖσθαι οἷς δεῖ· ἡ γὰρ ορθὴ παιδέια ἅυτη ἐςίν*"—(b. ii. c. 3).

We can perceive some of our Oxford friends smile at our taking the pains to transcribe such familiar passages from so much handled a book as the "Ethics;" but they seem so altogether to have passed from the memory of one of their elder brothers that quotation may not be altogether impertinent. Is it that since 1829, when Sir Robert Peel eschewed all those professions of his early life for which he had been preferred before so much more brilliant a son of Oxford, *George Canning*, that he has forgotten all the ethical lessons he conned on the banks of Isis? At any rate, it is a melancholy matter to reflect upon, that the heathen tutor of Alexander the Great should have drawn from the law written on his heart a purer scheme of morals than has been propounded by one to whom the page of revelation has been unfolded.

It is with no pleasure that we recur to this topic, but to mourn over a generation, the best and most honoured of whose leaders still lingers in the rear of Christianity. More painful still is the recollection, that last summer a distinguished prelate of the Church spoke of the spoliation of our cathedral institutions as merely the abolition of so many canonries, and declared that, for his part, he never wished to hear the service better performed than in the parish church of St. James's. So far as mere musical harmony is concerned, there will always prevail diversity of tastes; but few probably there have been upon whom, at some period, and under some circumstances, the pure and holy choral service, as once chanted in our cathedrals, has not produced an impression for which they have felt grateful. Often have we felt its refreshing, healing, strengthening, purifying influence, on our return to it after periods of labour and exhaustion; but, as a striking contrast, must observe, that the last time we were at divine service at St. James's, the opening and shutting of pews, the bargaining for seats, the rustling of restless sitters, continued during more than half the service; the congregation came to hear a sermon, prayer was a subordinate object: we will not, however, enlarge on this painful theme. The legislature has been pleased to reduce those ancient foundations of our cathedrals which in former times afforded so much facility and encouragement to study, and we must bow beneath the heavy blow. What we meant to indicate, by alluding to Sir Robert Peel's eulogium on the study of the natural sciences as an incentive to piety, and a "pleasure and consolation when every other source of pleasure and consolation has failed," and to a bishop's disparagement of cathedral service, was, that the commercial spirit of the age has reached and pervades the minds of our statesmen and our prelates; the overflowings of mammon surmount the bounds of the mart and the warehouse, and enter not only the walls of the senate, but the aisles of prayer. The speedy attainment of palpable results is the one universal test of excellence. "What do you get by it?" is the question first asked of any man engaged in any pursuit, as if no possible motive but that of gain could impel him to action; and the anxious father and tender mother chide their son, gently or sharply, as their natural disposition may prompt, but still they do chide him, if his answer implies that he labours solely for the good of his fellow-creatures or the honour of God. We do not confine our observations to the harsh hard worldling, who with unabashed brow acknowledges that mammon is in all his thoughts, *rem quocunque modo rem;* but we extend them to the decorous and the professedly religious classes of the community.

We must do something ourselves, or see something done; we cannot patiently pray to God to "have mercy upon all Jews, Turks, infidels, and heretics," but we must have some turbaned Turk or picturesquely attired Hindoo paraded on the platform of Exeter Hall, while the narrative of his conversion is welcomed with plaudits more suited to the hustings or the polling-booth than for the reception of the tidings that one sinner repenteth. The clergyman complains of the chill which the sight of empty benches and vacant pews strikes into his breast, as if even in the house of God he leant on the arm of man for support.

These may seem hard sayings, we will not pursue them; but they may serve as hints, φωνᾶντα συνετοισιν, though perhaps, to be very generally understood, they should be more expanded—ἐς ἓε τὸ πᾶν, ἑρμηνέων χατίζει. If, for instance, we were to say that at most of the meetings for missionary purposes held in Exeter Hall and elsewhere, there is an alarming irreverence displayed, a looking to impression rather than truth, we fear we should be misapprehended by some, and represented by others as discountenancing missionary labours. Far be from us any such intention; we only deplore the mode and tone which characterizes even religious actions in the present age. We would not have awful Christian verities mooted amidst cries of "*Hear, hear, hear,*" or have a blessing followed with "*rapturous applause.*" It has been revealed from heaven that there is no way of wisdom but that of obedience and the cross, and that no knowledge is valuable but what introduces us to the privileges of an invisible and eternal world. What are all our schemes of education but futile attempts to hew out for ourselves broken cisterns that will hold no water—a pursuit of paths different from the one which God has marked out for us? Let not the vain men of this age presume to think that in the divinely prescribed path there is not ample room for the loftiest intellect that ever animated the human form to expatiate, nor let busy men suppose that we are relegating them to the cloister and the cell, and interdicting an active discharge of the social duties we owe to each other. Far otherwise; we think, with Mr. Gladstone, that—

"We ought to be on our guard against that morbid teaching which inculcates an universal recoil from earthly objects as the true law of general morality; which treats this life on earth as if it were a mere accident of our being, and perceives nothing but empty vision in all its impressive and pregnant experience. On the contrary, it is an ordained and necessary part of the development of man; and when its regulation is committed to right laws it is in harmony, much more than in opposition, to the future and untroubled existence which awaits the faithful members of Christ."

It is not the advocates of Church principles, but their opponents, who disparage man's position on earth, and undervalue that body and those members which he bears about him here, and which shall exist anew hereafter, glorified, yet the same.

"It is very singular (remarks Mr. Gladstone, in another place) to observe how many of the pious among us actually seem to have forgotten that this body and its organs are portions of our proper selves. Rightly rejecting the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eye, and all that tends to the supremacy of sense in the lives of unthinking men, they rush into some capricious extreme, and regard the body as if it had little more of a permanent relation to themselves than the very clothes that cover it. Hence it seems to us strange to be told, that the body is a fit subject of Christian discipline in its own mode and measure, as well as the immaterial man. Hence we are apt to treat the respect shown to the remains of the dead as a tribute only to the memory of one who must doubtless have carried away from earth with him some fraction, at least, of human love, or as a security against making light of a subject so awful as death; but surely we ought rather to regard even the stark and breathless corpse as the subject of respect, and of a present and future interest—present, inasmuch as in it the deceased is paying, as we hope, the sole remaining forfeit of a sinful, but ransomed, nature; and future, inasmuch as that *frale* (according to the touching phrase of the Italians), that dust returning to dust, is part and parcel of that very humanity redeemed by Christ, part and parcel of the object of his love, and worthy therefore, surely, of ours. Hence it is that we scarcely understand why the resurrection of the body should have been so prominent a subject of the earliest controversies, even from the date of the first Epistle to the Corinthians—should have been secured from question by insertion in the earliest creeds—or should be declared, as it is by St. Augustine, *summa fidei nostræ, quæ separat ab infidelibus.*"

We must now draw our observations on Mr. Gladstone's "Church Principles Considered in their Results" to a close; before doing so, however, we express our regret that we have not been permitted by our limits to give a fuller analysis of its valuable contents. Enough, however, has been disclosed to induce all our readers to whom these discussions are interesting —and to whom do they not pertain?—to peruse the work for themselves. Let them do so in a serious, candid, patient spirit, and we will answer for it their labour shall not be in vain. It may not be unnecessary, in these days of strife and divisions, to warn impatient or prejudiced readers against a very cursory perusal of this book, and a hasty rejection of it, under a notion that it is an offshoot of the "Tracts for the Times." It is no such thing; it is based on a better foundation than one of any man's building—even on the teaching of the Holy Catholic Church.

We deem it not inappropriate, too, on this occasion, to say a

word on behalf of ourselves, more especially as we have been honoured by a quotation from our pages in the House of Commons, to lend sanction to a cause we should feel it dishonour to support. Lord Morpeth, to support his own views with reference to Maynooth, has recently wrested certain remarks against the "Tracts for the Times," which appeared some years ago in this Review, for which its present conductors *are not responsible*, and which they deem uncharitable; while, at the same time, they as decidedly object to the tendency of the "Tracts" as did the writers of the articles in question. Lord Morpeth's logic is, that since Popery is tolerated at Oxford, it ought in fairness to be encouraged at Maynooth. No logic lecture that we attended at Oxford enables us to feel the force of his lordship's reasoning; for whatever may be our past or present opinion of the "Tracts for the Times," the University is innocent of their parentage; and the State does not pay for their publication, as it does for the noxious writings issued from Maynooth. A few members of the University chose, at their own proper costs and charges, to print and publish, from time to time, some Tracts which they thought suitable to the present state of the Church. These Tracts came forth anonymously, and have from their first appearance been printed in London. The University of Oxford is no more responsible for them than for these pages, written by one of the humblest of her members, one now far and for ever removed from her peaceful happy shades; to which his recollections will, however, fondly cling, so long as memory can do its office—"*dulces moriens reminiscitur Argos.*"

The imposition of the responsibility of the "Tracts for the Times" upon the University of Oxford, is on a par with the falsehood reported to have been uttered by a reverend ultra Protestant last summer, at Exeter Hall: that the Romish "Breviary" was the commonest volume; and, moreover, the most saleable in the booksellers' shops at Oxford—an assertion which, in our love of sincerity, we designate a naked lie.

We feel it to be of incomparably less moment to correct an unfair use of anything that may have appeared in our pages, than to rebut a calumnious imputation on the University of Oxford; but we will, in conclusion, subjoin a few words strictly in reference to ourselves. If any discrepancy of tone between what appeared in this Review in the years alluded to and the present article is discernible, it will, we conceive, be equally manifest that different individuals have composed the former articles on the "Tracts for the Times," and the one we are now inditing. But with the internal arrangements of a periodical,

the public have only so far an interest as to require an explanation if any flagrant contradiction of former statements is made at any subsequent period.

With reference to our own position, we may remark, that having been quoted by Lord Morpeth, as dealing unqualified condemnation on the Tracts, and now admitting that their influence has been, on the whole, beneficial, we may, in the eyes of superficial observers, appear guilty of inconsistency. But we pray our readers to remember that many reviewers, disgusted with the flippant arrogance of poor Mr. Froude's Letters, which we tell the editors it was cruelty to expose to the rude gaze of the world, wrote strongly against separate Tracts, who, *without retraeting that censure*, have lived to admit that extensive good has been wrought by the influence of the series, inasmuch as they have stimulated men to a more careful observance of the rules prescribed by the Church for holy living. Admitting, however, thus much, and exonerating the learned and pious authors, whose lives might furnish a wholesome example to all of us, from any *intention* of inculcating Romish doctrines, we devoutly wish that much they have written had *not* been published to *the lay people*. The mere diversity of headings—*Ad Populum*, *Ad Clerum*, *Ad Scholas*, will not confine the perusal of Tracts, all of which are composed in the vernacular tongue, to the readers to whom they are severally addressed. In these days, when the Holy Scriptures are to be cast prostrate before each heedless babbler's, or silly woman's, private judgment, and any lewd hand is to be allowed to tumble and toss the contents of the Ark, we subject ourselves to a charge of intolerance in claiming this reserve in the communication of religious opinions; but, nevertheless, we do claim it, and think the Tract writers have violated one of their own most cherished canons, by the indiscriminate freedom with which they have exposed their ideas concerning mysteries not to be understood of the multitude. As there are dark counsels of God, into which the angels are not permitted to look, and no human being may scan—so there are many hard doctrines which, even if true, are not necessary to salvation, and which it is unsafe to communicate even to babes of grace, much less to a careless, scoffing world, who, by their profane reception of them, only heap upon themselves weightier condemnation.*

* Do not the Tract writers violate Isaac Casaubon's maxim which they themselves frequently quote:—"*Universam doctrinam Christianam veteres distinguebant in τὰ ἔκφορα, id est, ea quæ enunciasi apud omnes poterant, et τὰ ἀπορρήτα, arcana temere non vulganda?*" And does not Bacon speak soundly when he says, "It is a point of great inconvenience and peril, to entitle the people to

Earnestly, therefore, but in no unfriendly spirit, do we repeat our call upon the Tract writers to rest contented with what they have done, and desist from throwing any more stumbling-blocks in the way of the simple-minded. Are they not, at least, incurring the risk of doing that which they most strenuously condemn, namely, bringing into too prominent view certain teachers in the Church? The mere absence of a name from the title-page of the Tracts does not conceal the individual from very general detection. Only a few residents at Oxford may be exactly able to assign each particular Tract to its proper author; but the main body of the writers is publicly known, and their names attached, as terms of reproach or ridicule, to their followers. To our taste this practice is perfectly loathsome; and more, it is in direct violation of an apostolical injunction. A quarter of a century ago a pious clergyman of Cambridge had his respected name twisted into a by-word, and now the same is being done at Oxford. If we are told that this is mere thoughtlessness, that no harm is meant by it, no offence intended to be given, we implore our Christian brethren to remember that thoughtlessness in such a matter is sinful. It has been a distinguishing peculiarity and most blessed privilege of the Church of England not to be named after any man, however eminent or however excellent. Luther, and Calvin, and Arminius, and Wesley, have transmitted their names to their followers; but neither Wickliffe, nor Latimer, nor Ridley, nor Cranmer, has fastened his proper name on Christ's Church in England. *Magistrum unum omnes habemus, et in una schola condiscipuli sumus.* We find in a charge addressed by the present Bishop of Salisbury to his clergy, in 1839, such an admirable admonition on this head, that, with our earnest commendation of it to our brethren at Oxford and elsewhere, with it we will conclude our paper:—

"Have no divisions among yourselves. Do not say, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos. Range yourselves under no party banners. Call no man master. *Neither adopt for yourselves, nor be fond of applying to others, any of those party appellations,* which are so disagreeable to my feelings that I will not name them even for the purpose of marking them with censure. Be faithful ministers of the Church; and do not promote, and as far as possible do not know, of any subdivisions in it."

---

hear controversies and all kinds of doctrine?" They say no part of the counsel of God is to be suppressed, nor the people defrauded; so as to the difference which the apostle maketh between *milk* and *strong meat,* is confounded, and his precept, that *the weak be not admitted unto questions and controversies,* taketh no place.

ART. VI.—*Primitive Christian Worship; or the Evidence of Holy Scripture and the Church concerning the Invocation of Saints and Angels, and the Blessed Virgin Mary.* By the Rev. J. ENDELL TYLER, B.D. London: Rivingtons. 1840. 8vo.

2. *The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary Illustrated; or, a Critical Disquisition and Enquiry concerning the Genuineness of the Parody on the Psalms of David, commonly ascribed to St. Bonaventure; comprehending the First Fifty Psalms of the Psalter of the B.V. M., with Selections from the Remainder.* By ROBERT KING, A.B., S.T.C.D. Dublin: Grant and Bolton; London: Rivingtons. 1840. 8vo.

3. *The New Month of Mary; or, Reflections for each Day of the Month, on the different Titles applied to the Holy Mother of God in the Litany of Loretto; principally designed for the Month of May.* By the Very Rev. P. R. KENRICK. London: Dolman. 1841. 12mo.

4. *Tributo Quotidiano di affetuosi Preghiere e Lodi per ciascun giorno della Settimana alla immacolata Madre di Dio, Madre di Misericordia e Rifugio di Peccatori, Maria SS. onde godere del materno suo patrocinio in ogni di della vita, e specialmente degli estremi bisogni della morte, tratte dalle opere del Seraf. D. S.* BONAVENTURA, *con breve e utilissimo indirizzo per assistere alla S. Messa, e visitare la Via Crucis, ed altre aggiunte.* Roma. 1836. 18mo.

WE now resume the subject of Mary Worship as practised in the Church of Rome, and have the pleasure of introducing to the notice of our readers the valuable researches of the Rev. J. Endell Tyler, concerning "Primitive Christian Worship," announced in our last number.* Mr. Tyler's volume is drawn up in the form of a conciliatory address to Romanists, as being less controversial, while the facts and arguments which he has adduced remain the same. He eminently excels in "speaking the truth in love;" and if the class of religionists for whom he writes would *candidly* study and meditate upon the facts and arguments which he has adduced, we think that they must be constrained to abandon the errors of Popery. His volume con-

* See page 203 of the present volume. Our readers are requested to correct the following typographical errors: In page 176, last line, for *Latin* read *Italian*; and in page 190, line seven of the notes, for *Liga* read *Siga*.

sists of two parts; the first of which treats on the invocation of saints and angels; and the second on the invocation of the Virgin Mary. In the prosecution of his enquiry, Mr. Tyler has adopted the following order, viz.:—

"First, to ascertain what inference an unprejudiced study of the revealed will of God would lead us to make; both in the times of the elder covenant, when 'holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' and in that 'fulness of time' when God spoke to us by his Son.

"Secondly, to examine into the belief and practice of the Primitive Church, beginning with the inspired apostles of our Lord.

"Thirdly, to compare the results of those enquiries with the tenets and practice of the Church of Rome, with reference to three periods; the first immediately preceding the Reformation; the second comprising the Reformation, and the proceedings of the Council of Trent; the third embracing the belief and practice of the present day." (*Tyler*, pp. 12, 13).

The result of his researches, we cannot do better than state in his own words:—

"From first to last, the voice of God himself, and the voices of the inspired messengers of heaven, whether under the patriarchal, the Mosaic, or the Christian dispensations—the voices, too, of those maintainers of our common faith in Christ, who prayed and taught in the Church before the corruptions of a degenerate world had mingled themselves with the purity of Christian worship, combine all in publishing throughout the earth one and the selfsame principle—'Pray only to God; draw nigh to him alone; invoke no other; seek no other in the world of spirits, neither angel, nor beatified saint; seek him, and he will favourably, with mercy, hear your prayers.' To this one principle, when the Gospel announced the whole counsel of God in the salvation of man, our Lord himself, his Apostles, and his Church, unite in adding another principle of eternal obligation—there is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; whatsoever the faithful shall ask the Father in the name of that Mediator he will grant it to them: he is ever living to make intercession for those who believe in him: invoke we no other intercessor, apply we neither to saint nor angel, plead we the merits of no other. Let us lift up our hearts to God Almighty himself, and make our requests known to him in the name and through the mediation of Christ, and he will fulfil our desires and petitions as may be most expedient for us; he will grant to us in this world a knowledge of his truth, and in the world to come life everlasting!" (*Tyler*, pp. 395, 396).

Among the curious specimens of Romish invocation of saints, Mr. Tyler has given, at some length, copious extracts from the services in honour of the perjured traitor, Thomas à Becket, whom "the Holy Catholic Church sojourning at Rome" has enrolled in the calendar of *her* saints. For these precious spe-

cimens of adoration we have not space, as we wish to call the attention of our readers to his facts and observations on the *Mariolatry*, or worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary, as practised in the Church of Rome.

Of the Virgin Mary, Mr. Tyler most justly remarks, no "true member of the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church will speak disparagingly or irreverently."

"She was a holy virgin and a holy mother. She was highly favoured, blessed among women. The Lord was with her, and she was the mother of our only Saviour. She was herself blessed, and blessed was the fruit of her womb. We delight in the language of our ancestors, in which they were used to call her 'Mary, the Blissful Maid.' Should any one of those who profess and call themselves Christians and Catholics, entertain a wish to interrupt the testimony of every succeeding age, and to interpose a check to the fulfilment of her own recorded prophecy, 'All generations shall call me blessed,' certainly the Anglican Catholic Church will never acknowledge that wish to be the genuine desire of one of her own sons. The Lord hath blessed her; yea, and she shall be blessed.

"But when we are required either to address our supplications to her, or to sever ourselves from the communion of a large portion of our fellow Christians, we have no room for hesitation; the case offers us no alternative. Our love of unity must yield to our love of truth; we cannot join in that worship which in our conscience we believe to be a sin against God. Whether we are right or wrong in this matter, God will himself judge: and, compared with his acquittal and approval, the severity of man's judgment cannot turn us aside from our purpose. But before any one pronounces a sentence of condemnation against us, or of approval on himself, it well becomes him patiently and dispassionately to weigh the evidence, lest his decision may not be consistent with justice and truth." (*Tyler*, pp. 272, 273).

In reviewing the evidence of Scripture, the celebrated text, Gen. iii. 15, draws from Mr. Tyler the following conciliatory observations. Having noticed the rendering of the Roman Vulgate, which has "she" for "it," (see page 175 supra) he says—

"Whether the word dictated here by the Holy Spirit to Moses should be so translated as to refer to the seed of the woman generally, as in our authorized version, or to the male child, the descendant of the woman, as the Septuagint renders it, or to the word 'woman' itself; and if the latter, whether it refer to Eve, the mother of every child of a mortal parent, or to Mary, the immediate mother of our Saviour: whatever view of that Hebrew word be taken, no Christian can doubt, that, before the foundations of the world were laid, it was foreordained, in the counsels of the Eternal Godhead, that the future Messiah, the Redeemer of mankind, should be of the seed of Eve, and in the fulness of time be born of a virgin of the name of Mary, and that in the mystery of that incarnation should the serpent's head be bruised. I

wish not to dwell on this, because it bears but remotely and incidentally on the question at issue. I will, therefore, pass on, quoting only the words of one of the most laborious among Roman Catholic commentators, De Sacy: 'The sense is the same in the one and in the other, though the expression varies. The sense of the Hebrew is, the Son of the woman, Jesus Christ, Son of God, and Son of a virgin, shall bruise thy head, and, by establishing the kingdom of God on earth, destroy thine. The sense of the Vulgate is, the woman, by whom thou hast conquered man, shall bruise thy head, not by herself, but by Jesus Christ.'" (*Tyler*, pp. 274, 275).

It is not necessary that we follow the author through his patient examination of all the passages of the New Testament in which the Blessed Virgin Mary is mentioned. Let it suffice to state, that it confirms the *fact* we have already stated in page 172, viz., that "there is not a single text in the New Testament which affords any pretext whatever in favour of Mary Worship." The silence of the apostles John and Paul is a clear proof that no honours were paid by them, or in their time, to the Virgin Mary. Equally silent are the apostolical fathers, and subsequent ecclesiastical writers to the time of Athanasius. Having traced the traditions respecting the pretended assumption of the Virgin into heaven, Mr. Tyler puts the following pointed interrogatories:—

"Is it within the verge of credibility that had such an event as Mary's assumption taken place under the extraordinary circumstances which now invest the tradition, or under any circumstances whatever, there would have been a total silence respecting it in the Holy Scriptures? That the writers of the four first centuries should never have referred to such a fact? That the first writer who alludes to it should have lived in the middle of the fifth century, or later; and that he should have declared in a letter to his contemporaries that the subject was one on which many doubted; and that he himself would not deny it, not because it rested upon probable evidence, but because nothing was impossible with God; and that nothing was known as to the time, the manner, or the persons concerned, even had the assumption taken place? Can we place any confidence in the relation of a writer in the middle of the sixth century, as to a tradition of what an Archbishop of Jerusalem, attending the Council of Chalcedon, had told the sovereigns at Constantinople, of a tradition, as to what was said to have happened nearly four hundred years before, whilst in the "Acts" of that Council, not the faintest trace is found of any allusion to the supposed fact or the alleged tradition, though the transactions of that Council in many of its most minute circumstances, are recorded, and though the discussions of that Council brought the name and circumstances of the Virgin Mary continually before the minds of all who attended it?" (*Tyler*, pp. 318, 319).

The present worship of the Blessed Virgin is next exhibited

in the authorized and enjoined services of the Church of Rome, in extracts from the writings of Romish saints and doctors of that Church, and in popular manuals of devotion sanctioned by the recommendation of her prelates. A few of these are, perhaps necessarily, the same which were adduced in our last number; but the patient researches of Mr. Tyler have enabled him to collect very numerous additional instances. The Psalter of the seraphic doctor, *Saint* Bonaventure, of course, furnishes many examples. Taking every one of the hundred and fifty Psalms, he so changes the commencement of each as to address them, not, as the inspired Psalmist did, to the Lord Jehovah, the one only Lord God Almighty, but to the Virgin Mary; inserting much of his own composition, and then adding the Gloria Patri to each. So offensive to Papists are these specimens of direct invocation to the Virgin Mary, that some of them have affirmed that this Psalter has been put into the Roman Index of prohibited books, while others have not hesitated to assert that it never was written by Bonaventure.

The assumption that this Psalter was put into the Roman Index of prohibited books is satisfactorily refuted by Mr. King, in his elaborate and truly valuable publication, intituled "The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Illustrated" (No. 2 on our list). Mr. King thus states the result of his enquiries:—

"I have examined several voluminous indexes, prohibitory and expurgatory *(including that of the Council of Trent)*, *and in none of them* could I discover a vestige of Bonaventure's Psalter. On looking to the article 'Psalter,' I found indeed some copies of the Psalms of David disreputably noticed, but no Psalter of the Virgin there mentioned: and again, endeavouring to find something more to the purpose under the name of Bonaventure, I found it absent; the letter B, indeed, in some of those prohibitory catalogues, being so occupied with Bibles as to leave little room for much else." (*King*, pp. 83-4).

The assertion of the Papists, that the Psalter of Bonaventure was in the Index of prohibited books, being thus disproved, we now come to their other assertion, that this parody on the Psalms of David was not the production of the "seraphic doctor." For the details of proof that the "Psalter of the Blessed Virgin" was really and truly written by him, we must refer our readers to Mr. King's treatise. It must suffice here to state that the genuineness of this Psalter is proved by the facts: first, that it is included in the body of the Vatican edition of Bonaventure's works, published at Rome under the auspices of Pope Sixtus V., the editors of which assure us that they have thrown into the appendix all the works concerning the genuineness of which there was any doubt; and secondly, it is further recom-

mended, in the strongest terms, by the highest individual authority in the Romish Church:—

"For a Papal bull has stamped it with approbation, as may be seen by referring to the extracts given from the bull of Sixtus V., keeping in mind that the Psalter of the B. V. M. was one of those minor works there noticed, having appeared as such in the Vatican edition, published by order of the aforesaid Sixtus V. himself: nor was there, indeed, at that time, any doubt in the Church relative to its authorship. It was, therefore, one of those works which were to be 'cited, adduced, and referred to, whensoever occasion should require, in seminaries, schools, colleges, academies, lessons, disputings, interpretations, addresses, sermons, and all other ecclesiastical exercises.'

"It would appear that this bull was by no means neglected, but that, on the contrary, the Psalter so recommended was very generally read and admired. And if its reputation may be judged of by the number of editions through which it has passed, certainly we cannot well conceive how it could have risen much higher." (*King*, pp. 84-5).

Mr. King enumerates twenty-eight editions, the earliest of which was published at Venice, in 1476, and the most recent at Rouen, in 1823. But what proves beyond the possibility of doubt the genuineness of Bonaventure's "Psalter of the Blessed Virgin," is the FACT that a considerable part of it is embodied in the "Tributo Quotidiano" (No. 4 at the head of this article), or "Daily Tribute of Affectionate Prayers and Praises, for every Day in the Week, *to* the Immaculate Mother of God, the Mother of Mercy and Refuge of Sinners, the Most Holy Mary;"..... "*drawn from the works of the Seraph[ic] D[octor], S[aint] Bonaventura.*" The title on the wrapper of our copy states that it is the eighth Roman edition ("Edizione VIII., Romana"). It was published in 1836, and is further authorized by the reimprimaturs of "Fr. Angelus V. Modena, S. P. M. S.," and of "A. Piatti Archiep. Trapez, Vicesg." When it is recollected that so rigid is the censorship over the press at Rome, that not even a hand-bill can be printed without the license of the master of the apostolic palace and his deputy, our readers will readily conclude that this "Tributo Quotidiano," or "Daily Tribute" to the Virgin Mary, could not have been printed, if the devotions which it contains had not been in strict conformity to the genuine doctrine of the Romish Church.

We will now give two specimens from the Psalter of Bonaventure (out of several which might be offered), first in Latin and English, and then in Italian and English, premising only that it is expressly stated, in the "Tributo Quotidiano" (p. 15), that the Psalms are taken from a little work of St. Bonaventure, intituled "The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin." "*I Salmi si*

sono desunti dall' opuscolo di S. Bonaventura, intitolato de Psalterio B. V.:"—

PSALMUS I.

" Beatus vir qui diligit nomen tuum, Maria Virgo: gratia tua animum ejus confortabit.

" Tanquam aquarum fontibus irrigatum uber: in eo fructum justitiæ propagabis.

" Benedicta tu inter mulieres: per credulitatem cordis sancti tui.

" Universas enim fœminas vincis pulchritudine carnis: superas angelos et archangelos excellentiâ sanctitatis.

" Misericordia tua et gratia ubique prædicatur: Deus operibus manuum tuarum benedixit. Gloria Patri, &c." *(King,* p. 1*)*.

PSALM I.

" Blessed is the man that loveth thy name, Virgin Mary: thy grace shall strengthen his heart.

" As a fertile [spot] moistened by the water streams: thou shalt plant in him the fruit of righteousness.

" Blessed art thou among women: for the believing disposition of thy sacred heart.

" For in the beauty of thy person thou surpassest all women: thou excellest angels and archangels in the advancement of holiness.

" Thy mercy and grace are everywhere told forth: and God hath blessed the operations of thy hands. Glory be to the Father, &c."

SALMO I.

" Beato è quell' uomo, che nutre affetto di devozione pel vostro nome, o Maria: * giacchè il favor vostro porterà conforto al suo spirito.

" E quasi in giardino da fresca fonte inaffiato: * propagherete in lui l'eletto frutto di giustizia.

" Benedetta Voi siete infra le donne: * per la fede, che regna nel vostro cuore.

" L'amabilità del vostro aspetto supera in verità quella d'ogni terrena creatura; * l'altezza della vostra santità quella sorpassa degli angioli e degli arcangeli.

" La vostra misericordia e grazia, onde siete ricolma, si celebrano per tutto il mondo con somme lodi: * Ha Iddio benedetto le vostre operazioni.

" Sia Gloria al Padre ec." *(Tributo Quotidiano,* pp. 15, 16).

PSALM I.

" Blessed is the man who cherishes a feeling of devotion for your name, O Mary: since your favour will bring comfort to his spirit.

" And as it were in a garden watered by a fresh fountain: you will increase in him the choice fruit of justice [or righteousness].

" Blessed are you among women, through the faith which reigns in your heart.

" The loveliness of your countenance exceeds in truth that of every earthly creature; the loftiness of your holiness surpasses that of angels and archangels.

" Your mercy and grace, with which you abound, let them celebrate through the whole world with supreme praises: God has blessed your works.

" Glory be to the Father, &c."

PSALMUS XXX.

"In te Domina speravi, non confundar in æternum: in gratia tua suscipe me.

"Tu es fortitudo mea et refugium meum: consolatio mea et protectio mea.

"Ad te Domina clamavi, dum tribularetur cor meum: et exaudisti me de vertice collium æternorum.

"Educas me de laqueo quem absconderunt mihi: quoniam tu es adjutrix mea.

"In manus tuas Domina commendo spiritum meum: totam vitam meam et ultimum diem meum. Gloria Patri, &c."

PSALM XXX.

"In thee, O Lady, have I put my trust, let me never be put to confusion: in thy grace uphold me.

"Thou art my strength and my refuge: my consolation and my protection.

"Unto thee have I cried, O Lady, when my heart was in heaviness: and thou hast heard me from the top of the everlasting hills.

"Draw me out of the net that that they have laid privily for me: for thou art my helper.

"Into thy hands, O Lady, I commend my spirit: my whole life and my last day. Glory be to the Father, &c." (*King*, pp. 23, 24).

SALMO XXX.

"In Voi ho riposta, o Signora, la mia speranza, non resterò in eterno confuso: * ricevetemi, ve ne supplico, nella vostra grazia.

"Piegate benigna l'orecchio vostro a'miei preghi; * e nella tristizia mia consolatemi.

"Voi siete la mia fortezza e il mio sicuro asilo, * mia consolazione e mia difesa.

"A voi nell'afflizion del mio cuore sollevai supplichevole le mie voci; * e dagli eterni colli pronta mi esaudiste.

"Nelle mani vostre affido, Signora, il mio spirito: * a Voi raccomando la vita mia, ma più l'estremo mio giorno.

"Sia Gloria al Padre ec.

"*Antif.* Nelle vostre mani raccomando, o Signora, il mio spirito, tutta la vita mia, ma più l'estremo mio giorno.

"*Antif.* Muovetevi a pietà." (*Tributo Quotidiano*, pp. 25, 26).

PSALM XXX.

"In you, O Lady, have I reposed my hope; I shall not eternally be put to confusion: receive me, I pray, into your favour.

"Bow down your favourable ear to my prayers: and in my sorrow console me.

"You are my strength and my safe resting-place, my consolation and my defence.

"To you, in the affliction of my heart, I raised my suppliant voice; and from the eternal hills you have favourably heard me.

"Into your hands, O Lady, I commend my spirit; to you I commend my life, but chiefly my last day.

"Glory be to the Father, &c.

"*Antiphon.* Into your hands, O Lady, I commend my spirit, during my whole life, but chiefly on my last day.

"*Antiphon.* Be moved to compassion."

The following are the concluding sentences of the "Canticle, like that of Habakkuk iii:"—

"O Benedicta, in manibus tuis est reposita nostra salus; recordare, pia, paupertatis nostræ.

"Quem vis, ipse salvus erit, et a quo avertis vultum tuum, vadit in interitum."

"O thou Blessed, our salvation rests in thy hands. Remember our poverty, O thou pious One.

"WHOM THOU WILLEST, HE SHALL BE SAVED; AND HE FROM WHOM THOU TURNEST AWAY THY COUNTENANCE, GOETH INTO DESTRUCTION." (*Tyler*, p. 353).

The Te Deum, and what is commonly called the Athanasian Creed, are both lamentably (we might almost say blasphemously) perverted to the praise of Mary, whose pretended assumption into heaven is thus specified as one of the points necessary to be believed, on pain of losing all hopes of salvation!

"Quicunque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est ut teneat de Maria firmam fidem.

"Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that we hold firm the faith concerning the Virgin Mary: which except a man keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. . . . .

"Quam demum ipse in cœlum assumpsit, et sedit ad dexteram Filii, non cessans pro nobis Filium exorare.

"Whom at length he took up (assumpsit) unto heaven, and she sitteth at the right hand of her Son, not ceasing to pray to her Son for us.

"Hæc est fides de Maria Virgine: quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit."

"This is the faith concerning Mary the Virgin, which except one believe faithfully and firmly he cannot be saved." (*Tyler*, p. 365).

Mr. Tyler concludes his extracts from Bonaventure with the following prayer, directly addressed to the Virgin Mary; and as he has not given the original Latin, we have subjoined it for the information of our readers. It is taken from the "Crown of the Blessed Virgin Mary:"—

"O igitur imperatrix et Domina nostra benignissima, IURE MATRIS IMPERA TUO DILECTISSIMO FILIO Domino nostro, Jesu Christo, ut mentes nostros ab amore terrestrium ad cœlestia desideria erigere dignetur." (*Bonaventuræ Opera*, tom. vi., p. 466, col. 1, E. Moguntiæ, 1609 fol.)

"Therefore, O Empress, and our most benign Lady, BY THY RIGHT OF MOTHER, COMMAND THY MOST BELOVED SON, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he vouchsafe to raise our minds from the care of earthly things to heavenly desires."

Mr. Tyler adduces numerous passages from the writings of Biel, Damianus, Bernardinus de Bustis, Bernardinus Senensis, and other writers and saints of the Romish Church, as well as from various modern works of devotion in use among Papists, not forgetting the extract from the encyclical letter of Gregory

XIV., the present bishop of the Holy Catholic Church sojourning at Rome, which we gave in our last number. (See pp. 179, 181). Among the more recent manuals of devotion in honour of the Virgin Mary, one only has escaped his indefatigable researches, viz., "The New Month of Mary," No. 3 in our list at the head of this article. This is a reprint of a transatlantic publication, which is introduced with the approbation of "Francis Patrick Kenrick, Bp. Arath. and Coadj. of Bp. Philadelphia." Within the last few years the author states that the special consecration of the month of May to the honour of the Virgin Mary has been introduced into the United States, where it "has been practised by numbers of the faithful servants of Mary, who eagerly profit by this opportunity of testifying their love and gratitude to the Holy Mother of God." (Pref. p. 3). We have room only for one specimen, in which the misguided votary *prays directly* TO the Virgin for conversion and for grace, which it is the peculiar office of God the Holy Spirit to confer:—

"O most powerful, because most faithful, of God's creatures! I presume to approach thee with a lively sentiment of my own unworthiness to address God, whose indignation I have so much deserved; and with a strong conviction in the efficacy of thy intercession with Jesus, thy Divine Son, who has placed in thy hands all power and strength. May these sentiments always increase within me, that I may never presume on my own strength, but place all my confidence in thee. OBTAIN FOR ME, O GLORIOUS VIRGIN, A SINCERE CONVERSION, STRENGTH AND RESOLUTION IN THE HOUR OF TRIAL, AND THE GRACE OF FINAL PERSEVERANCE. Jesus can refuse thee nothing; whereas my iniquities render my prayers unworthy of being regarded by him. Thou hast crushed the head of the infernal serpent, and snatched from him the prey which he hoped to possess for ever. O powerful Mary, preserve me against the rude assaults by which he endeavours to regain what he has lost; and do not permit me ever more to relapse into my former state of servitude. Amen." (*New Month of Mary*, p. 72).

We return to Mr. Tyler, to state that, in his appendix, he has *convicted* Dr. Wiseman, the most recent advocate of Popery, of citing as *genuine* various *spurious* passages of some of the fathers of the Church; but this is nothing new in the annals of Popish controversy. In an early part of his volume Mr. T. has convicted Bellarmine of the like fraud. In conclusion, we tender our thanks to Mr. Tyler for his valuable labours in exposing the idolatrous worship of the Virgin Mary by the Romish Church, and we cordially recommend his volume to our readers, who will derive much information on a prominent article of the Romish faith, respecting which the majority of Protestants are very inadequately informed.

ART. VII.—*The Choephoræ of Aeschylus. With Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Philological.* By the Rev. THOMAS WILLIAMSON PEILE, M.A., late Senior Fellow and Tutor in the University of Durham. London: John Murray. 1840.

IN a shorter time than might have been expected from the nature of the work, Mr. Peile has produced his promised edition of a second play of Aeschylus—the "Choephori"—accompanied with a most laborious and voluminous commentary of nearly four hundred pages of very closely printed letter-press. Although the "Choephori" is a much shorter play than the "Agamemnon," the editor's notes upon it exceed in length those upon the latter by about fifty pages; and are, indeed, evidently penned in total defiance of the old adage—*A great book is a great evil.*

That these notes are a great deal too long, we are decidedly of opinion, be they intended for learners, matured scholars, or both at once; and that the writer of them is not gifted with the art of condensing, or expressing with conciseness, what he has to say, we think equally undeniable. The bulk of the work is augmented by a vast addition of Latin notes, which Mr. Peile has very freely extracted from previous editions, and interspersed with his own observations upon them and upon the text: the whole forming, when taken together, a painfully tedious and verbose miscellany, which few, we suspect, will have courage to encounter, and still fewer perseverance to read half through.

There are several objections to be made against the modern system of writing long rambling English notes in what is miscalled illustrating ancient authors: the fact being, that, in nine cases out of ten, the writers are anxious only to illustrate themselves. The necessarily high prices at which such works are to be procured; the great mass of extraneous matter they invariably contain; and their consequent liability to retard or discourage the enterprising reader in his progress through the entire works of an ancient author, by making him dwell an unconscionable time upon a very small portion of that author, "illustrated" by a commentary, which, perhaps, takes as long to read as would the whole of the original; these are some of the reasons which induce us to doubt the expediency of a practice which now appears likely to be generally adopted by too ambitious or too communicative editors. The same opinion we from the first entertained respecting the lengthy pleasantries of a learned editor of Aristophanes; but Mr. Peile has fairly out-Mitchelled Mr. Mitchell, and to him must the palm of prolixity now be awarded by unanimous consent.

The object, however, which Mr. Peile professes to have had in view was not so much to write a series of explanatory notes upon a play of Aeschylus, as to "contribute to a more accurate knowledge of the language in which the Greek tragedians wrote." (Preface, p. 5). We are bound to express our opinion —and we could wish we had it in our power to award a higher meed of praise to the labours of a most industrious and indefatigable scholar—that in this respect Mr. Peile has not as yet satisfactorily established his claim to be ranked among the distinguished few whom posterity will ever regard as real benefactors to Greek literature, however much his laudable, if occasionally unsuccessful, attempts to develop and express precise shades of meaning, his desire to advance nothing without sufficient proof or competent authority, and the minute and thoughtful research he everywhere displays, may entitle him to our admiration and gratitude. But Mr. Peile is wont to indulge too much in a kind of misty philosophy, which delights in endeavouring to trace out subtle distinctions that never existed, and latent senses that were never intended; and in attempting this he frequently gets so far and so deep into roots, and principles, and primary meanings, that he loses himself, and overwhelms his own and his reader's intellects in inextricable confusion.* Thus, little that he says on these and similar points produces anything like conviction upon the mind of the student. His remarks give the impression, that to advance further than any previous adventurer has done is the favourite aim of his philosophical speculations: and we cannot but feel that he is frequently on dangerous sands, and within a hair's breadth of being wrecked for his temerity. It will, doubtless, be alleged, in extenuation of the twofold charge of prolixity and mysticism, that the extreme difficulties of the author, and especially of the particular play the editor has selected for illustration, as well as the abstruse nature of his enquiries, demand not only much space, but considerable depth in their exposition. And with those who entertain this opinion we have no wish to quarrel; though we do ourselves decidedly hold, that notes shorter, plainer, and less desultory, would have made the volume before us infinitely more useful. We think, too, that Aeschylus is for this reason peculiarly unfit to be selected (see Preface, p. 6) as a subject for grammatical comments of a speculative

* Take, for example, the following extraordinary version of three verses in Homer, Il. x. 224. (Appendix to the "Agamemnon," p. 393). "'*Tis*, or *it be*, when two go together, *that it be*, this man vies with that in contriving how good may come of it; but alone, if *it so be*, a man shall have set his wits to work, still *it be* with him, slower *be* wit yea and slight *be* counsel." Surely this is sad profitless stuff.

nature; that, as the text is extremely mutilated and uncertain, a rash philologist is too apt (as Mr. Peile has in several instances done) to draw conclusions from insufficient induction, and to build theories upon the occurrence of a solitary word or phrase, which the poet, in all probability, never penned nor dreamt of.

As a critic, Mr. Peile appears to us to take what is called "the safe side," of admitting none but absolutely necessary alterations into the vulgate text, even to a fault. Where, however, he has ventured upon emendations of his own, or of others, he is not always either judicious or successful. Several almost certain corrections he has rejected, while in one or two instances he had better have retained the ordinary readings of the MSS. and early editions. This must, indeed, ever be a matter of opinion; we hope, however, in the following remarks, to give satisfactory reasons for our belief. Still we think that, upon the whole, his revision of the text is, perhaps, the best that has yet appeared; and to have achieved this is, though not a superhuman task, neither a small nor an unimportant matter. That it might have been yet better, we have little hesitation in asserting.

The "Choephori" is unquestionably a play of surpassing difficulties. All who are as well versed as Mr. Peile in the writings of the Greek dramatists, and whose acquaintance with them is derived, not from popular treatises and analyses, but from a laborious, uncompromising, and thoughtful study of all the peculiarities of style and diction for which the originals are so remarkable, will probably be willing to concede, that the play before us is *the most difficult* extant—for that strange mixture of wild bombast and affected obscurity, the "Casandra" of Lycophron, we do not care to include in the comparison. And this difficulty is mainly caused by the present imperfect state of the text. The "Choephori" is, in fact, about the most corrupt and mutilated play of the most corrupt author whose works we possess; and hence arise nine-tenths of the perplexities which everywhere beset our path in its perusal. We trace little, in this play, of the depth of mind, the covert allusion, the refined dissimulation, the prophetic tone, which pervade the "Agamemnon," and constitute so much of its obscurity. Nor do we tread over the ground with the cautious vigilance necessary in reading the "Eumenides," fearful lest a political allusion should lie hid under every stone we may upturn. The notion, indeed, of preternatural agency—the instigation of Apollo, and the conduct of Hermes—is sustained throughout the piece, and especially developed, according to the favourite arrangement of

Aeschylus, in the choral odes. But the play contains more of direct narrative, a more active plot, than either of the sister tragedies of the "Orestea;" and the aid of the critic, rather than that of the philologist, is called for in surmounting the numerous obstacles with which our progress through it is constantly interrupted.

The remarkable corruption of four out of the seven tragedies of Aeschylus, as contrasted with the comparative purity of the remaining three, is certainly a surprising circumstance. It is probable that from some cause—perhaps partly the more popular nature and easier style of the "Seven at Thebes," the "Persæ," and the "Prometheus," and partly the depth and obscurity of the "Orestea" (to give no opinion of the "Supplices"), which, in the declining period of literature, was little understood—the three former plays continued in general circulation, while the rest dropped into silence and oblivion, and were, in some later age, rescued from moths and "opic mice" by the discovery of a single mutilated copy, from which a scanty supply of MSS. was transcribed (carelessly enough, we doubt not) and propagated. Hence we may understand why more MSS. are extant of the former, and why the ancient grammarians much more frequently quote them than they do the latter. The loss of a leaf from this archetypus has deprived us of the Greek argument, and the first part of the prologue, to the "Choephori;" and thus caused this and the preceding play to be continued, in two of the early editions, without any break or interruption, under the name of the "Agamemnon." From a comparison of the length of the prologues to the "Agamemnon" and the "Eumenides," we might infer that more than two or three lines (which Aeschylean enthusiasts persuade themselves is the amount of the damage) are wanting at the commencement of the "Choephori;" but this is a question now beyond the reach of conjecture to determine.

In the present imperfect state of the text, no editor can hope to level all obstacles and remove all difficulties: and he who, while he carves and slashes the least, gives the safest and most approved interpretations of the various obscure passages which occur in the play, is, upon the whole, undoubtedly entitled to our best thanks. For, while we may admire a conjectural emendation, we ever prefer to acquiesce in a plausible exposition of the received text, *provided it be strictly consistent both with the laws of the language and the sense of the passage.* And Mr. Peile, who, if sometimes wanting in correct taste and judgment, is certainly no mere pretender to scholarship, but a sound and deeply-read proficient in the science of Greek, has

proved himself generally to be a cautious critic and a sober commentator, as far removed from extravagance on the one hand, as he is from infallibility on the other. More than this we do not feel justified in saying.

As a translator of Aeschylus, we think Mr. Peile, in most instances, singularly infelicitous. His versions are never poetical, seldom neat, and not unfrequently positively vulgar. They are too often hampered with an encumbrance of clumsy verbiage, which is designed to convey the precise tone and meaning of the original, but which hardly ever fails to make the sense of the author tame, obscure, or ridiculous. A servile version may, indeed, be useful for beginners, as showing the actual force of individual words; but can seldom be adopted without a sacrifice of poetic beauty. We are very far indeed from advocating the practice of lax translation; we do, however, protest against a total disregard of the tone and pathos of Aeschylus' Greek. In page 8 of his preface to the present play, Mr. Peile endeavours to exculpate himself from the just charge of vulgar (or, if he pleases so to call it, *common*) translation in his edition of the "Agamemnon." Now, in our opinion, his notes upon the "Choephori" prove throughout that he has not condescended to profit by the hint given him in the "Quarterly Review;" for he has in the latter play, even more than in the former, outraged good taste and propriety by the frequent introduction of low and coarse phraseology, be they vulgarisms, commonisms, Durhamisms, or any other *isms*, with which modern terminology has barbarised the English vocabulary. As an example of our meaning, we would ask, what opinion would an ordinary English reader form of the poetry of Aeschylus, from the following translation, (Choeph. 673, 688):—

El. "Woe's me! *clean down* upon the ground is the desolation of our house! O insuperable curse, how many objects you have your eye upon, even things carefully *stowed away*, bringing them down with well-aimed arrows from a distant bow. For even now Orestes was in luck; but now, what soothing hope there was in the house of seemly merriment, he *scores down* at what I see."

Or. "Nay, for my part, I could have wished to have become known and welcomed by entertainers of your condition, because of some good matter: for what more kindly feeling is there than that of a stranger to his hosts? But with me it were in my judgment a thing bordering hard upon impiety, not to have gone through with such a matter among friends, after having solemnly promised, and after having been hospitably received."

Can anything be conceived more inconsistent with the spirit and poetry of Aeschylus than such a translation? The phrases we have printed in italics, instead of conveying any idea of the

utter and hopeless distress assumed by Electra, respectively suggest to the reader's mind the notion of a dustman flooring a chimney-sweep in a pugilistic encounter; of a sailor with a long pigtail, or a burly wharfinger, in a smock frock, loading a vessel; and of a publican chalking up certain pots of ale supplied "on tick" to a customer. Moreover, all these, it is quite unnecessary to add, are not only of themselves gratuitous metaphors, solely and entirely of the translator's insertion, but (in one instance at least, that of the bow, where, by the way, ἐπωπᾶν signifies rather "to take sight at,") even violate other metaphors adopted by the poet: for what has "stowing away" goods to do with the notion of escaping from an arrow? The words κἀκποδὼν εὖ κείμενα are very easily rendered, "even though safely laid out of danger." We only wonder that Mr. Peile did not keep up the pot-house metaphor, by rendering βακχείας καλῆς "capital backy."

Contrast Potter's version of the above passage:—

El. "Ah me! thus desolation on our head
Is fall'n. O thou relentless curse, whose rage
Hung o'er this house, has thy unsparing eye
Marked what we lodg'd at distance, aiming there
Thy cruel shafts, to rob me of my friends?
E'en now Orestes, who with cautious tread
Had from this gulf of ruin freed his foot—
E'en he, the hope medicinal to the madness
Of this ill house, shows that our hope betrays us."

Or. "It were my wish to have borne other tidings,
More welcome to the lords of this fair mansion,
And meriting their hospitable favours:
For what more strongly to benevolence
Can bind the grateful soul? Yet I should deem it
An impious wrong not to disclose e'en these,
Unwelcome as they must be, to his friends,
So solemnly entrusted to my charge."

This is far, indeed, from being one of Potter's most successful efforts, nor is it by any means a very close version; but it is at least free from the glaring faults we have pointed out in Mr. Peile's translation.

But the above is by no means the only passage which furnishes examples of similar literary delinquencies. We read in verse 60 of "thorough-going affliction;" of "turning trickster," verse 211; of "being shipped off," in verse 124; of "thrusts of a hand coming pell-mell," in verse 410; of "now's the time to be doing," in verse 450; of "whisking a sword about" a person, in verse 562; of "grief, no thanks to it!" in verse 714; of "out in one's reckonings," in verse 740; of

"employing language on the sly," in verse 794; and of "heaps of serpents," in verse 1031. Such expressions are not only utterly unworthy of Aeschylus, but, in most instances, actually *slang terms.*

The verses 405, 415, (410, 420, ed. Scholf.) Mr. Peile has travestied thus:—

"Why, what would ye have us to have been speaking of other than that we have experienced, even sorrows, at the hands, mark ye (γε), of them that gave us birth? No! one may gloze, but there is no glossing over them; for, just like a savage wolf, we have to thank our mother for a spirit that cannot be wheedled." Electra. "I am as one that beats (upon her head) the Arian stroke, or with the gesticulations of a Cissian mourner! In a shower of blows, yea, and from many quarters, you may have noticed the thrusts of a hand come pell-mell down from a great height: and even so with beating rings my battered, and, in every sense, unhappy head."

We believe the above translation, if such it can be called, to be absolutely unparalleled. The pleasant pun between *gloze* and *gloss*, though not in the Greek, was perhaps introduced by Mr. Peile to relieve the monotony of a somewhat heavy passage.

The words of Aeschylus are bombastic, obscure, and corrupt. Adopting a punctuation which yields infinitely better sense than the new-fangled arrangement of Klausen, whom Mr. Peile has followed, we translate, *literally*, thus:—

"But what can we rightly say? Can we assuage the ills we suffer from our parents? No, they are not to be soothed; for I have a spirit like a savage wolf, not to be appeased through my mother (*i. e.*, which my mother's treatment will not allow to be appeased). I struck me an Arian stroke; and amid the wailing notes of a Cissian mourner, you might have seen my hands extended (the extensions of my hands) from above, from aloft, with a quick succession of lacerating and far-stretched blows; and my unhappy head resounded with the noise of the beating."

The word ἀπρικτόπληκτα (as Klausen correctly writes it) signifies "striking by tearing the flesh with the grasp of the nails," "nail-clutching."

We shall now proceed to make some remarks upon certain notes, readings, and interpretations in Mr. Peile's book; and, in doing so, shall confine ourselves chiefly to an examination of passages of acknowledged difficulty, omitting such as, from their hopeless and inveterate corruption, appear to admit of no satisfactory, or even tolerable, elucidation. In the art of Porsonian criticism—an art, it should seem, approachable by very few living scholars—Mr. Peile does not prove himself an adept. It is, indeed, with regret that we perceive this profound

science, which has achieved so much in the successful restoration of Greek literature, and even the immortal labours of Porson himself, now too generally depreciated. There are not a few who would substitute vague hypotheses and fantastical conceits for the sound learning and extraordinary accuracy of observation which characterized the mind of that unparalleled critic. Altogether destitute of the acute sagacity by which he could recover, from a mutilated fragment, the long lost words of an ancient author, with a precision and certainty that carries with it little short of absolute conviction to the mind of the reader; and possessing nothing of that unerring judgment which can, at a glance, discriminate the hand of the writer from the interpolation of the grammarian; editors of this school (critics they are not) would philosophize themselves into the persuasion that they can elicit sense out of what their wiser predecessors have pronounced nonsense, and prove, by a series of far-fetched inductions, credible to none but themselves, that the sanction of usage is of very little importance, if their own peculiar process of reasoning should happen to arrive at a result directly opposed to it. Now usage is *everything* in language. Well has a late lamented scholar observed, that though we may be "no advocates for the licentious extravagance of those critics who make a display of their own skill and ingenuity at the expense of their author; still, on the other hand, great caution is necessary, lest, in our zeal for the authority of the MSS., we should assert it in defiance of the laws of the language. If every editor should adhere with tenacity to the readings of his MSS., and those readings, which are at variance with rules, were to be added to the catalogue of exceptions, there is no solecism or irregularity for which we might not find a sanction; and the grammar of the language, instead of being simplified and reduced to more general principles, as the language is more studied, would become almost a chaos of perplexity and confusion." *

That to Mr. Peile this censure not very indirectly applies, will, perhaps, appear hereafter.

Verse 1.—We differ, *in limine*, with Mr. Peile, in his interpretation of the words πατρῷ' ἐποπτεύων κράτη, which we think much better explained by Aeschylus himself (Aristoph. Ran. 1146) to mean πατρῷον γέρας κεκτημένος—"superintending the offices (or *powers*, in allusion to his numerous attributes) committed to you by your father." Mr. Peile's version, "looking on me with the might of your father," should at least have been supported by reference to passages where the plural κράτη is

* "Philological Museum," vol. i., p. 209.

used in a precisely similar sense. At the same time, we willingly allow that ἐποπτεύων more naturally bears the meaning which Mr. Peile has assigned to it.

We pass over the mutilated prologue, and the corrupt and difficult parode, both of which are explained at great length by Mr. Peile, without stopping to notice anything more than two specimens of very tame and awkward translation. The first is in verse 27—"The breast-protecting array of dresses, struck because of saddening occurrences:" the second in verse 30—"For a lucid house-interpreter of dreams, even *bristling* terror, *making sleep the vehicle of the anger which it breathes*, with a shriek at dead of night has fearfully spoken from within, falling with heavy pressure upon the women's apartments." Verily, this version is itself somewhat of the "heavy pressure" description, and not remarkable for either conciseness or accuracy. The words in italics might, perhaps, have been rendered simply "inspiring dread in sleep." The word κότος, in Aeschylus, sometimes appears to imply *any excitement of feeling*. (Compare Suppl. 724, inf. 1006, Eumen. 849, &c.) If, however, the recurrence of κότον πνεῖν elsewhere, in a somewhat different sense, should be thought to make this version doubtful, we still protest against Mr. Peile's clumsy periphrasis, and would translate "breathing wrath in sleep," as in verse 521, ἡ δ' ἐξ ὕπνου κέκραγεν.

Verse 78.—τάφῳ δὲ χέουσα. We cannot persuade ourselves that these words ever proceeded thus from the pen of the poet. The editor translates: "The tomb, I say! whilst I am pouring over it these mourning libations, how am I to speak it?" (rather *him*,* we opine). The pettish and not very poetical exclamation *I say!* is intended to convey the precise force of δέ; and Mr. Peile adds the following abstruse explanation, in defence of the pestilent little particle: "δὲ here throws emphasis on τάφῳ, both as the correlative term suggested by the previous mention of τῆσδε προστροπῆς, and as the foremost in the group of ideas included in the speaker's mind, under the general designation of τῶνδε." We confess this very intelligible exposition does not at all satisfy us of either the meaning or the propriety of δὲ, and we do not think that any of the passages (to which might have been added Soph. Oed. Col. 592 and 813) adduced in support of it, bear the least analogy to the present. The particle, which offends alike both sense and metre, should manifestly be expunged, having probably arisen from some correction (as διδοῦσα) written above χέουσα, and not being found in two of the early editions.

* *i. e.* Agamemnon.

In verse 84, we meet with a passage of great difficulty, of which no satisfactory solution has as yet been offered. Mr. Peile conceives τε to be used in the exegetical sense, which it frequently bears in Aeschylus. The great objection to this explanation in the present case is, that there is no accusative *expressed* after ἀντιδοῦναι, to which δόσιν can be placed in opposition, through the medium of the particle τε. Our own opinion is, that στέφη is a mere marginal gloss, designed to explain τάδε, which has supplanted some such word as δίκην, or τῖμον. As the text now stands, we incline to Klausen's interpretation, suggesting, at the same time, the bare possibility of ἐπαξίαν being a substantive.

Verse 100.—σεμνὰ τοῖσιν εὐφροσιν. "Make honourable mention of those who wish him well," (P.) Rather (with the scholiast), "Pray for blessings on his friends."

Verse 121.—βροτοῖς. With this word Mr. Peile, after Klausen, connects χέρνιβας, and renders it "human lustrations," which is not very satisfactory. We venture to propose ῥυτούς.

Verse 123.—Mr. Peile's explanation of this obscure verse is original and ingenious, and very probably the true one. We might, however, read, simply enough—

ἐποικτείρειν ἐμέ·
φίλον δ' Ὀρέστην πῶς ἀνάξομεν δόμοις;

In the next verse, we neither approve of Mr. Peile's judgment in retaining πεπραγμένοι, nor of his vulgar translation (especially in a passage of great pathos): "for now we are converted into produce, as it were, and *shipped off* by our mother." This, like a good many of the editor's versions, smacks most unwarrantably of nautical phrase. As for the first point, we admit that πράσσω may *originally* (though not in the time of Aeschylus) have been synonymous with πιπράσκω; but the peculiar aptitude of πεπραγμένοι in this passage, as opposed to ἐπράθην, in verse 895, does not by any means appear to us; for we deny that Orestes, in the latter verse, complains of having been sold for a sum *in specie*.

Verse 135.—This is another very obscure passage. Mr. Peile considers δίκην to be equivalent to ὁμοίως, and translates "in like manner." Bad as this is, it is certainly better than Klausen's most untenable idea, that ἀντικατθανεῖν δίκην means *moriendo solvere quod justum est*. Mr. Peile asserts that "the junction of τιμάορον δίκην is not to be thought of." For our own part, we, nevertheless, incline to think very seriously of it, and to translate the passage simply thus: "I summon avenging justice to come, (namely) that your murderers may also die in

their turn"—*i. e.*, as you have died before. What Mr. Peile can possibly mean by saying the version of the late Bishop of Lichfield's, which he gives, is "nearly to the same effect" as Klausen's, we cannot conceive; for no two translations could easily be more different.

Verse 137.—ἐν μέσῳ τῆς κακῆς ἀρᾶς. We believe that it is impossible to elicit any tolerable sense from this reading: while τῆς καλῆς appears to us both apt and easily intelligible, in spite of Wellauer's *dictum*, "that, if it has any meaning at all, it is so tame and frigid that Aeschylus could not have written it."

From verse 130 to 133, Electra prays for happiness and virtue; from 134 to 136, she imprecates curses upon her enemies; and again, from 139 to 140, she reverts to her former strain, and asks blessings upon herself and her brother. Surely, then, it is not *very* monstrous to say that the curse in verses 134-6 is "inserted between the words of her good prayer." And we will suggest to Mr. Peile the reason *why* she says this, namely, in order to keep the curse *strictly distinct* from the prayer, *ominis gratiâ;* whereas, without this explanation of her exact wishes, she fears the good may be confounded with the bad, in the case of her own personal petition. Hence does Electra most naturally and properly add ΚΕΙΝΟΙΣ—οὐκ ΕΜΟΙ—λέγουσα τὴν κακὴν ἀράν. Of the corruption of καλῆς into κακῆς nothing need be said, for it is not an uncommon one, and in the present instance was almost to be expected.

Verse 155.—Here Mr. Peile is wide of the mark, from pressing too closely a somewhat bold poetical expression. Aeschylus uses the same word, βέλη, to express two different kinds of weapons, which he distinguishes by adding to them respectively the epithets παλίντονα and αὐτόκωπα, *reflexive* and *hilted*—*i. e.*, *bows* and *swords*. Hence there is no occasion for a long rambling note, to prove that αὐτόκωπα means "adapted for close fighting, up to the very hilt," or "weapons which cut and thrust, *as it were*, handles and all." How a sword can cut and thrust, *as it were*, with its handle, we do not understand; but Mr. Peile tells us it means "hilt to hilt."

Verse 168.—Here again Mr. Peile has a long note to show that ἦν is the true reading, instead of ἦ. That Aeschylus wrote ἦν is certainly highly probable; and the sense is unexceptionable, if ἦν be understood to refer to the point of time when the lock was deposited: "Do you think Orestes secretly placed it here?" If ἦ be really correct, it is a very remarkable use of the deliberative subjunctive, and must be rendered, "Do you think, then, it may prove to be from Orestes?" The question is one of grammar, rather than of sense; and the usage can only

be defended (if at all) by such expressions as φροντίζω μὴ ἄριστον ᾖ, (Herod. i. 155); σκόπει μὴ φυλακτέα ᾖ, (Soph. Oed. Col. 1180). The note on verse 170, to prove that ᾖ must be wrong, is vague, obscure, and fanciful, and by no means proves anything of the kind. Nor do we believe Orestes would have used the questionable, or, at least, little understood idiom, which the editor has attributed to him; καὶ πῶς ἐκεῖνος δεῦρο τολμήσαι μολεῖν. Surely, if the lock should *hereafter* prove to belong to Orestes, he must *have actually arrived* before, since he had already deposited it. Electra, it will be observed, assumes, as correct, the hypothesis of the chorus: "Why, yes, I think it *will* prove to be his;" to which the chorus replies by the question, "How, then, durst he come?" We refer Mr. Peile to Herod. i. 75, *ad fin.* and Eurip. Rhesus, 845. We must not, however, omit to mention, that ᾖ is condemned as a solecism by a late very learned reviewer in the Philolog. Mus. i., p. 237.

Verse 197.—Mr. Peile retains the reading of the best copies, ποδῶν δ' ὁμοῖοι. His exposition of this δὲ is truly miraculous: indeed, upon this principle, we might translate and explain almost any word that could occur, however difficult and unexampled the use of it might be. We read ποδῶν θ' ὁμοῖοι, but do not think that even thus ποδῶν must of necessity be the genitive after ὁμοῖοι. Compare Prom. 42, where read ἀεί τε.

Verses 217 to 220.—That the original order of these verses has been, by some accident, disarranged in the copies, is generally admitted; and may, indeed, be fairly inferred, from the transposition of verse 218 after verse 220, in the edition of Robortello. Mr. Peile has, as usual, followed Klausen, in retaining the order found in the majority of the copies; but has ventured upon an explanation, which, though certainly ingenious, is about as far-fetched as could well be conceived. The passage is a very difficult one, and it is more than probable that something has been lost. If we follow Mr. Peile, we are driven to the unsatisfactory hypothesis that "the foot-prints of your brother, who is the same size as your head," means "the same size as you;" thus overlooking, as we best may, the awkward association of *head* with *feet*; or, if we connect συμμέτρου with τριχός, we attach to the adjective a sense which it does not properly bear. If any change, not warranted by the ancient copies, must be made, we would read thus:—

> "σκέψαι, τομῇ προσθεῖσα βόστρυχον τριχὸς
> σαυτῆς ἀδελφοῦ, συμμέτρου τῷ σῷ κάρᾳ;"

that is, "apply to the stump this shorn lock of your brother's hair, which corresponds with your own:" implying, first, that

Orestes was the person who deposited the lock, and, secondly, that he was her own brother indeed.

After verse 223, a verse seems to have been lost, thus:—

"ἰδοῦ δ' ὕφασμα τοῦτο, σῆς ἔργον χερός,
σπάθης τε πληγάς. εἰς δὲ θηρίων γραφὴν
[βλέπουσα, κόσμον χρυσεοστόλου χλιδῆς,]
ἔνδον γενοῦ, κ. τ. λ."

Verse 264.—τοῦ πατρὸς τοὺς αἰτίους. "Unless I shall visit (with vengeance), for my father, those who have to answer for him," or "those who are guilty concerning him." Nothing can be more unsatisfactory than this interpretation; but, at the same time, nothing more obscure than the Greek. We have little doubt that the original words of the poet, τοῦ φόνου, have given place to a marginal or interlinear gloss, τοῦ πατρός. Such a use of the genitive as Mr. Peile supposes can hardly be defended; and the same must be said of the imaginary ellipse of δίκας, though it is altogether another matter to make πατρὸς depend on δίκας.

Verse 266.—This verse even Klausen, who certainly does not stick at trifles, has declared (with some show of reason, it must be confessed) "inexplicable" in its present position, and he has accordingly transposed it so as to stand after verse 276, where, in our opinion, it is not a whit more apt or intelligible. To Mr. Peile we probably owe the restoration of this passage, by his ingenious and very slight alteration of ταυρουμένους into γαυρουμένους, which he renders "proudly exulting, as they now are, in the injuries whereby they have deprived me of my property." There is, perhaps, no one passage in Aeschylus, of the same length, containing so many insurmountable difficulties as the present speech of Orestes, which is, probably, so mutilated and corrupt, as to be now beyond hope of restoration. Klausen's interpretations are, in many cases, absolutely *monstrous*. We recommend the student to follow implicitly the explanations of Mr. Peile, who has displayed considerable judgment, though remorseless prolixity, in his commentary upon this *locus vexatissimus*.

If, in verse 274, we might venture to translate ἐφώνει με ὁρῶντα "he spoke of me as seeing," the difficulty of this and the two next lines, which is very great, would at once be removed; we believe, however, this use of φωνεῖν is altogether indefensible by examples.

Our want of time and space compels us to pass over the whole of that most obscure and corrupt ode, which is tediously extended from verse 297 to verse 464, and is *(pace magni poetæ)* little better than a tissue of absurd bombast and affected rant, relieved by a very few redeeming passages of some little pathos and beauty. We shall, however, notice that the expres-

sion πευκάεντ' ὀλολυγμὸν, in verse 374, has been universally misinterpreted to mean, "a shout over the funeral pile," or, as Mr. Peile still more oddly renders it, "a torch-lit shout," from the idea that πευκήεις must (as in Soph. Antig. 123) mean *pitchy*, as derived from πεύκη, *a fir-tree*. Buttmann has shown (Lexil. p. 319) that the root of this word, πυκ, (Lat. *pungo, pupugi*) contains the idea of *sharpness*, and that πεύκη is *the pricking tree*—from the shape, by the way, of its *leaves*, rather than its spiry form. Had Buttmann thought of adducing this passage, and a much stronger one, in verse 630, ὀξυπευκὲς ξίφος, he might have advanced inference to positive proof; since the latter, from the nature of the compound, *must* mean "a *sharp* sword." Hence it is evident that πευκαενθ' ολολυγμὸν is simply "a *piercing* shriek," like φθόγγον πικρὸν, Soph. Oed. Col. 1610, compared with κνώδων πικρὸς, Ajax. 1024, πικρὸς ὀϊστὸς in Homer, &c.

In verse 372, Mr. Peile should by no means have admitted the conjectural alteration τέλει τέλει for τελεῖται. The passage is admirably explained by the late Bishop of Lichfield, in a note quoted, but unaccountably disregarded, by the editor. In the corresponding verse of the antistrophe, 386, Mr. Peile has been equally wrong in retaining the manifestly corrupt reading τετιμέναι, to the rejection of Hermann's certain emendation (admitted even by Klausen, who almost invariably swears by the flagrantly corrupt old Medicean copy) τὰ χθονίων τιτηνά. This restores at once both sense and metre—the favourite logaoedic termination of Aeschylus: and we think Mr. Peile has displayed bad taste in censuring Klausen for being once in the way wise enough to admit a conjectural correction.

Verse 476.—δὸς δέ τ' εὔμορφον κράτος. This verse is awkwardly rendered by Mr. Peile, who appears, from several of his notes and interpretations, to have conceived very extraordinary ideas of the power of δέ, "and give *thou* (emphatic), O Proserpine, therewith beauteous strength." We read, δὸς δ' ἔτ' εὔμορφον κράτος. See Prom. 955, ed. Scholf. where the same corruption occurs.

Verse 493.—τὸν ἐκ βυθοῦ κλωστῆρα σώζοντες λίνου. This verse does not seem to have been as yet correctly explained. Mr. Peile renders it, "Yea, they are as it were corks floating a net, which hold up the flaxen thread that evolves itself from the bottom of the water." (!) Although a very few instances may be adduced of the separation of the article from its subject, (see, for example, Soph. Oed. Col. 1584; Theocr. vi. 18; Trachin. 117; and compare Aesch. Prom. 721; Ag. 863,) we certainly do not consider the order of the words to be σώζοντες ἐκ βυθοῦ τὸν κλωστῆρα λίνου, but that the construction is σώζοντες ἐκ βυθοῦ τὸν ἐν βυθῷ κλωστῆρα, just as οἱ ἐξ ἀγορᾶς ἔφευγον, means οἱ ἐν ἀγορᾷ ἔφευγον ἐξ ἀγορᾶς.

Verse 504.—Mr. Peile has here followed Klausen; as we think, very injudiciously, there being no conclusive testimony in favour of τόδε. Compare Herod. iv. 132. Πέρσαι οὕτω τὰ δῶρα εἵκαζον.

Verse 516.—τινὸς βορᾶς χρῄζοντα, &c. We have considerable doubts whether the indefinite τινὸς can be allowed to stand first in a sentence. τίνος is evidently the true reading, for the sense of the passage is this: "Requiring what food?" "She gave it the breast;"—where the answer is manifestly equivalent to "wanting milk." In the former case, Aeschylus would have written βορᾶς τινὸς χ. The passage in the "Agamemnon," 1218, quoted by Mr. Peile in support of the present, he has altogether misunderstood; the meaning being, "*who* is engaged in murdering?"—and it is to the dulness of the chorus, in not understanding *who* the individual so clearly described above can be, that the whole context refers.

Verse 522.—ἀνῆλθον. Surely the authority of the scholiast, who explains this word by ἀνέλαμψαν, the precisely parallel passage adduced from Sophocles, λαμπτῆρες οὐκ ἔτ' ἦθον, joined with the fact that ἦθον is there, in one MS., corrupted into ἦλθον, ought to have induced Mr. Peile to admit the certain emendation ἀνῆθον. In the "Agamemnon," verse 641, as well as in the two passages quoted by Mr. Peile, ἀνελθεῖν appears to us to signify *to rise up*, not *to return*, as Klausen supposes.

Verse 543.—δόλῳ τε καὶ λῃφθῶσιν. These words are generally considered to present serious difficulty, and almost every editor has stumbled upon the remarkable use of τε; of which examples likewise occur in verse 843 of this play, and Agam. 99. We know not whether such passages as the following have yet been applied to the solution of this singular idiom; but we are of opinion that they are of a perfectly similar nature, and prove that the usage is not, as has been thought, confined to Aeschylus:—Aristoph. Ach. 24; Equit. 392; Lysist. 560; Theocr. 4, 61. 15, 17. These will show, that as the Greeks commonly say λέξας εἶτα γενοῦ, they also occasionally say λέξας καὶ εἶτα, or εἶτα δὲ, γενοῦ: λέξας καὶ γενοῦ, or λέξας γενοῦ τε. Thus, in the present instance, κτείναντες δόλῳ τε καὶ λῃφθῶσιν (may *also* be caught) is no more a redundancy than ποιήσας καὶ ἄπειμι, or λέξας καὶ εἶτα γενοῦ. In these cases, the particle τὲ or δὲ marks the apodosis of the clause; and in the verse before us, καὶ, in addition to τε, qualifies or strengthens λῃφθῶσιν.

Verse 555.—Mr. Peile says that "the dative πύλῃσι limits the meaning of τὸν ἱκέτην, and at the same time pertains also to ἀπείργετε, 'Why, pray, do you keep out at your gates one that is a suppliant there for admission?'" This is a somewhat

gratuitous assumption, it must be confessed: but πύλῃσι is, in fact, the dative of the instrument *by* which (*i. e.*, by shutting which) the suppliant was kept from entering. So Aristoph. Eccles. 420, ἦν δ' ἀποκλείῃ τῇ θύρᾳ. (Compare Vesp. 775; Sallust, Catil. 28; *januâ prohibiti*).

Verse 559. Mr. Peile translates clumsily: "or say that, having come, he shall thereupon talk to me face to face, mark my words, and set himself before my eyes—having whisked about him with nimble weapon." To justify the elegant expression, "to whisk about a person," the editor adduces, in illustration of what he is pleased to call this "*colloquial and conventional* use of βάλλω,"—a use, by the way, as old as Homer, and, we believe, the original one—two passages where the verb signifies *to pelt*, and two where προδεικνύναι occurs in the sense of *to grope*: the connection of which with the present sense of περιβαλεῖν is not very intimate. The expression of Aeschylus is peculiar, and no doubt means, as Klausen has explained it, "having surrounded him with swift sword;" *i. e.*, having brandished it round his head previously to striking him with it. Why, we would further ask, must we suppose *donare aliquem pecuniâ* a "colloquial" usage, when the earliest writers say. δωρεῖσθαί τινα ἀργύρῳ in the same sense?

Verse 638.—Αἰγίσθου δίαι. This villanous reading, which would, at all events, not only have been δία, but, if we mistake not, διά, Mr. Peile has admitted very injudiciously, instead of the simple and easy one, βίᾳ, *i. e.* βίαι. The sense is, *si hospitales sunt Aegistho*; that is, *si Aegisthus habet hospitales*: "if he keeps a hospitable house." Aeschylus never uses δίαι for διὰ, except when compelled by the *metri necessitas*: and, moreover, βίᾳ is the reading of the Medicean copy.

Verses 640 to 649.—This passage is, in every edition that we have seen, incorrectly punctuated. The 645th verse, which should begin with a capital letter, Ἐξελθέτω τις, &c., commences the *actual words* which the servant is enjoined by the command ἀγγελλε, &c., to deliver to his master. The proper disposition of the passage in English will at once suggest the corresponding arrangement of the original: "Go and say to the lords of the house, for whom I bring tidings—(and hasten on your way, for 'tis time wearied strangers should have rest)—these words: 'Let the lady, whoever she be, or, better still, the lord of the mansion, come forth,'" &c.

Verse 673.—We cannot regard Mr. Peile's emendation ἐμπέδως, for the corrupt ἐν πᾶσ' ὡς, as a very felicitous one; and of his version of this and the following verses, which we have already given, we still less approve. The editor, indeed, con-

fesses that the meaning he has attached to ἐμπέδως is unusual; and that it is a mere forced translation, to give any sense at all, there can be no doubt. He, however, compensates for a rather weak piece of criticism, by appending the following valuable and important remark: "ἐμπέδως, as partaking more of the nature of a dative, expresses the *virtual* or anticipated *consequence* of the process of *being thoroughly devastated;* or, in other words, the result towards which the action, whether the agent so designs it or not, has in itself a natural and necessary tendency. In Latin, this adverbial form of apposition (?) is expressed by help of the preposition *in*, in English *for;* thus ἐμπέδως *in perpetuum*, Angl. *for a continuance, for good and aye!*" &c.

Now we shall just venture to state our firm opinion—which, indeed, we have already expressed—that notes of this kind (for with the individual note we do not so particularly quarrel) are the most useless sort of classical, or rather philosophical, lumber with which an edition of an ancient author can be encumbered. They are mere impalpable, unconvincing, unsubstantial truths, if truths they really be; they produce no effect, leave no impression, upon the mind of the learner; and will be more likely to discourage and deter him, in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred, than to induce habits of original investigation and deep thought. We hear enough, in the classical writings of the present day, about subjectivity, and objectivity, and dramaticity, and idealism, and conceptualism, and materialistic psychology, and Heaven knows what besides, to scare any sober-minded student in our Universities. And we should have refrained in this particular instance, especially after what we have before said, from expressing ourselves thus, were it not that the above is precisely the style of writing and train of thought which characterize almost every page, and not unfrequently whole pages together, of Mr. Peile's editions of the "Agamemnon" and "Choephori," and which we cannot but regard as very inappropriate appendages to works not only already much too long, but, from their very nature (if they can be said to have any particular nature), entirely unsuited to rambling philosophical disquisitions. In saying this, we speak solely in reference to their aptitude and fitness for general readers—for that the study of the Greek language cannot be successfully prosecuted without an admixture of thoughtful enquiry, it would, of course, be absurd to maintain. But Mr. Peile's philosophy (especially as exhibited in his Appendix to the "Agamemnon") seems to us to be generally fanciful, and always obscure. It has a mystifying, puzzling, semi-metaphysical kind of tendency; it deals with mere possibilities, and, if

ever so well understood and remembered, the student will have grasped but an unreal shadow. He is thus far more likely to be led (as Mr. Peile evidently has himself been) to entertain ideas of the power and meanings of words which are quite at variance with actual usage, and to infer that because he conceives a certain principle *ought* to be correct, it necessarily is so, than to advance by sure and cautious steps to a practical, rather than a merely speculative, knowledge of the Greek language. This appears to be a great deal too much the taste of the present day.

In the passage before us, supposing the reading of two ancient editions, ἐνθάδ' ὡς, to be necessarily wrong—of which we are by no means satisfied—we might venture to suggest the alteration of ἐν πᾶσ' into εἶπας, or εἶπες, the singular propriety of which will appear by referring to the verse a little above, τοσαῦτ' ἀκούσας εἶπον. From the constant confusion observable in Greek MSS. between ι and ν, the above emendation is very slight. The sense will then be simply this: "Thus much I have told you from hearsay." "Alas! *you have told us* how utterly we are undone."

Verse 682.—ἐγὼ μὲν σὺν, &c. These words are incorrectly rendered, "Nay, for my part, I could have wished." The sense is rather, "I could have wished now," &c., the apposition being ἠθελον μὲν ἂν—πρὸς δυσσεβείας δ' ἦν. Mr. P. is wrong in taking μὲν οὖν in combination.

Verse 689.—It is to us perfectly incredible that Aeschylus should have written ἀξίως, which will barely admit of the most forced interpretation, instead of the simple and easy ἀξίων, which we should not hesitate to restore. The corruption arose from the σ in the next word σέθεν. We shall here observe, that in the "Supplices," verse 225, we should read μάταιος αἰτίαν, instead of μάταιον αἰτίας, which is nonsense, the final letters having, in this instance, been transposed.

Verse 714.—No editor has thought fit to explain the meaning of the words ποῖ πατεῖς πύλας; which Mr. Peile renders, "Whither away, pray, come you to the palace gates?" First, can πατεῖν πύλας properly signify "to come to the gates?" Secondly, if so rendered, does it make sense? Surely Aeschylus wrote δωμάτων πέλας, as Euripides has περῶντα τῶνδε δωμάτων πέλας, Herc. Fur., v. 138. Compare, however, Aristoph, Pax., 157.

Verse 716.—Αἴγισθον—τοὺς ξένους. Mr. Peile here follows Klausen, in understanding ἄνωγεν to be put for ἄνωγεν λέγειν, "bids me say." This, though a very harsh and unnatural ellipse, is remarkably similar to a construction adopted by

Tacitus, Ann. xi. 3, *init.*, and elsewhere. It is, perhaps, just possible that ξένους may be the accusative after καλεῖν, because that verb necessarily implies *motion towards*:—"My mistress bids me call Aegisthus *to come to* the strangers." We would, however, read τοῖς ξένοις, with Professor Scholefield.

Verse 726.—"How *what I may call the old mess* of intolerable woes that have chanced in this house of Atreus, afflicted my heart within my breast." This the editor rightly calls translating "in plain terms." To us, ἤλγυνεν appears to be more correctly rendered "*have* grieved."

Verse 749.—ἦ πῶς; λέγ' αὖθις. There is no reason why Mr. Peile should find a difficulty in the words λέγ' αὖθις. The whole passage is to be understood thus: "How does Clytemnestra order him to come?" "Did you ask *how*? Repeat your question." "I asked whether she would have him come attended or alone." Hence no mark of interrogation should be placed after verse 750. The editor might have apprized his readers, that in verse 753 αὐτὸν is equivalent to μονοστιβῆ, *alone.*

Verse 820.—μόρον δ' Ὀρέστου. "The death, namely," or, "the death, they would say, of Orestes." Mr. Peile; who further informs us, that the "connecting δὲ, in this sense, corresponds most nearly to the English *again.*" This statement we shall take the liberty to doubt; for we are not, by any means, believers in all the fantastic and capricious meanings which the editor chooses to inflict upon the unhappy word in passages where, being corrupt, it cannot be explained in any ordinary way. In the present case, we read μόρον τ' Ὀρέστου, the change of δὲ into τὲ, and *vice versâ*, being extremely common in MSS. Τε will then bear its usual Aeschylean sense of *nempe* (just as *que* does in Latin), "I mean the death of Orestes." So in Suppl. 41: δῖον πόρτιν ἴνίν τε βοός. 59: οἰκτρᾶς ἀλόχου ἀηδόνος τε (in both which places Professor Scholefield is sadly wide of the mark). 675: μοῦσαι θεαί τ' ἀοιδοί, and in many other instances. In the same verse, Mr. Peile has, in our opinion, incorrectly explained ἀμφέρειν "to give vent to this rumour." Klausen is much nearer the truth, the sense being this: "to attribute the death to our family, would be an additional burden;" *i. e.*, if the people get hold of the report before the particulars are known, they will be sure to suspect us of having caused his death. The reading of Turnebus, ἂν φέρειν, should not hastily be rejected.

Verse 882.—Neither Klausen nor Mr. Peile take any notice of this verse, which is by no means a very easy one. The sense appears to be, "choose to have all the world, rather than heaven, at enmity with you."

Verse 898.—μάτας, "properly *wanderings*; here, in a moral sense, *follies, incontinency.*" Why not "*errors,*" if such be the true sense of μάτη? which, however, we very much doubt, as the word is extremely rare, and the interpretations of the grammarians attach other meanings to it.

Verse 910.—ἑκανές γ' ὂν οὐ χρή, (MSS. κάνες γ'.) It is strange that any editor should retain, and even attempt to explain as essential to the sense, this intrusive particle γε, which is evidently a mere insertion of some grammarian to prop up the metre when it had been destroyed by writing κάνες for ἑκανές. (This reminds us of a note of Klausen's on the "Agamemnon," verse 1188, where, in endeavouring to explain the atrocious "emendation" of Jacobs, ἴτ' ἐς φθόρον πεσόντα γ'. ὧδ' ἀμείψομαι, which he admits into the text instead of the corrupt πεσόντ' ἀγαθὼ δ' ἀμείψομαι, he coolly tells us, "bene additur particula, *quia in cadendo positum coronarum exitium!!*") So we find in verse 1002 ἄλλος γε, *metri gratiâ.*

In the fine speech of Orestes, extending from verse 952 to verse 985, in Mr. Peile's edition, there are many and great difficulties, of which we can now only notice two or three.

Verse 955.—φίλοι τε καὶ νῦν. Mr. Peile has penned a most obscure and muddy note in defence of the corrupt τε, the present being about the twelfth instance in this play alone, where δὲ and τὲ have changed places. He should not have rendered τότε "then," the word being equivalent, (if MSS. are to be always trusted) in some instances, to ποτε. (See Stallbaum on Plat. Protag. p. 325, *ad fin.* and add Agam. 1128; Aristoph. Thesm. 13).

Verse 969.—ὡς νόμου. This the editor interprets "as assigned by law;" and supposes it to be the genitive, implying "that from which anything emanates." To us this is perfectly incredible. Better to translate, "as of a violator of the law;" although even this is objectionable, because αἰσχυντὴρ properly means *an adulterer*, as Agam. 1604, εὐνὴν αἰσχύνουσα (before which verse, by the way, there is evidently something lost). But we strongly suspect that Aeschylus wrote αἰσχυντῆρος ἀνοσίου δίκην. By some accidental transposition of the letters, as ος ανιου, how easily might ὡς νόμου have arisen!

Verse 973.—μύραινά τ' ἢ τ' ἔχιδν' ἔφυ. "So I read with Robortello," says the editor. But of this perfectly portentous collocation of particles, signifying at once *and* as well as *or*, we need hardly inform our readers that he adduces no example. We think Dobree's sagacious explanation of this strange and obscure passage infinitely preferable to any that has been yet suggested. Mr. Peile's poetical version is as follows:—"What

think you? conger or viper, which is more adapted by its mere touch to cause mortification, without one's having been bitten by it, for the matter of boldness and unrighteous purpose?" Whether the *muræna* was a lamprey or a conger-eel, is a question not very likely to be settled, in our days, without some trouble, the probability being, that its existence (in Greek, at least) was about as real as that of a *wyvern*, or a *cockatrice*, or a "King's Arms." We wonder some learned German does not write a book to prove that it was an *electric eel*, for he might make the verse σήπειν θιγοῦσα μᾶλλον οὐ δεδηγμένον speak volumes in his favour.

Verse 978.—δίκτυον μὲν οὖν, "a net, however, or a snare you might call it." But μὲν οὖν signifies "nay rather," not "however;" and surely a better word might have been obtained from some sporting friend to express ἄρκυς, (which is a particular *kind* of net) than the indefinite term "snare."

Verse 994.—νῦν αὐτὸν αἰνῶ. Mr. Peile reads, after Hermann, αὐτὸν, *myself.* The copies, however, all give αὐτὸν, which may, as Mr. Donaldson has suggested (New Cratylus, p. 529), refer to φόνον. The meaning of the whole verse is, in our judgment, extremely obscure.

Verse 1002.—ἄλλοις ἄν, εἰ δή. τοῦτ' ἄρ' οἶδ' ὅπη τελεῖ. Thus the editor has chosen to read for the corrupt ἄλλος ἂν εἰ δὴ τοῦτ', &c., complaining that the very felicitous emendation of Erfurdt, ἄλλος φανεῖ δῆτ', οὐ γὰρ οἶδ' ὅπη τελεῖ, conveys no intelligible meaning. Yet surely the meaning is simple enough: *another must show the end of all this, for I cannot.* We do not think that many will be inclined to prefer to this easy version, the following one, now first excogitated by Mr. Peile: "With others it may be, if it indeed be, as you say! This case of mine, I trow, I know how 'twill end." The meaning of *this* one might well ask.

The very next verse contains much difficulty. We have no doubt that ἡνιοστροφῶ, which at once removes the whole of it, is the true reading. In the time of Aeschylus, both ω and ου were expressed by ο. Mr. Peile, it appears, takes a very different view of the passage, which he renders thus, (by the aid of a trifling ellipse, to elicit a meaning of some kind out of the first clause): "Just as if I were [struggling] with horses, I feel that thoughts, that will not be restrained, are hurrying me, in my own despite, off the driving course; whilst at my heart terror is preparing to sing, and dance thereto, in wrath." This ellipse far oustrips anything in the redoubtable Lambert Bos, and strongly brings to mind an anecdote we have heard of a schoolboy, who sent up the following verses, among others, on the Gunpowder Plot:—

"Guy Vulpes, calidus, frigidus, postquam omnia cœpit;
Attamen inventus arripiebat eum:"

which, when called upon to explain them, he interpreted thus: "Guy *Fox* was a hot-headed rascal and a cold-blooded villain when he undertook all his plans; but being found out *(the constable understood)* took him up." But, to resume our remarks on the passage before us, γάρ, which, according to Mr. Peile's explanation, is placed after the fourth word, is, he tells us, equivalent to γε ἄρα; the last of which "marks the inference οἷδ' ὅπῃ τελεῖ τοῦτο, whilst the γε points out the precise sensation on which that inference is founded." If γε does all this by itself, it is a mighty clever little particle! We will only add, that κότῳ should not have been rendered *in wrath*, but, *through the violence of my emotions.* (See our remarks on verse 30).

Verse 1022.—Praise is due to Mr. Peile for being the first editor who has viewed this passage in its true light—as a hopelessly corrupt, mutilated, and therefore unintelligible fragment. That imperturbable commentator, Klausen, who *will* translate and explain with all imaginable gravity and pretended facility the most portentous enormities of the Medicean copy, passes over these verses with provoking indifference, and without deigning more than a word or two upon them, as though they were perfectly easy, and within the reach of the most ordinary capacity. It is much to be lamented that the conclusion of this play—which, in our judgment, surpasses that of every other extant Greek tragedy in grandeur of conception and magnificence of diction—should be deformed by so many and such apparently hopeless corruptions. Of the four last verses of the present speech, half the first occurs Pers. 269; and the whole of the third (one word only excepted) Agam. 1253; which seems a somewhat suspicious circumstance.

Verse 1031.—Mr. Peile has here ventured, on his own conjecture, of which we very decidedly disapprove, to print φαιοὶ χίτωνες (χιτῶνες) for the reading of every copy, φαιοχίτωνες. That the latter word was *pronounced* φαιοκχίτωνες, has already been suggested; and the well known, and we think perfectly analogous, examples in the "Seven against Thebes," verses 483 and 542, with several others, adduced in support of the hypothesis. (See "New Cratylus," p. 298). To these might be added Αἰσχινάδου (*i. e.*, Αἰσχιννάδου), in Aristoph. Pax. 1154; the only apparent example in the same author (Acharn. 220), where the above solution is inapplicable, having been felicitously disposed of by the learned Dr. Wordsworth, "Athens and Attica," page 224. Now it appears, that in all the above cases the *pronunciation* could not be affected by the actual repetition of the

consonant, for the purpose of lengthening the naturally short syllables; that is, Ἱππομέδων *sounds* the same as Ἰμπομμέδων, φαιοχίτωνες as φαιοκχίτωνες; and the ear, in fact (*our* ears, at least), can detect no difference whatever between them. But, as the Greek plays were composed strictly to be *heard*, and not to be *read*, such repetition, because in the former case altogether unnecessary, was not resorted to. We would ask, what grounds can commentators possibly have, to lay down as a rule that this license was exclusively confined to the case of proper names, and in them, to the republication of the *liquid* consonants alone? If the ear was, as we believe, made the sole criterion of the admissibility of the principle in question, then is φαιδχίτωνες as correct as Παρθενοπαῖος or Τελεύταντος. Thus we find ὄφις (*i. e.*, οπφις) and φαρμᾶκὸς (φαρμακκὸς) in Ionic writers. (See also Aristoph. Equit. 416; Lycophron, 953). Mr. Peile's translation of the text, after he has thus corrupted it, is such, that we think every student will without hesitation acquiesce in the old and perfectly correct φαιοχίτωνες:—"See! see! good serving-women, here are like Gorgons! dusk-coloured tunics, and they curled over with a heap of serpents!" How much better does Potter render it:—

> "Ha! look, ye female captives, what are these,
> *Vested in sable stoles*, of Gorgon aspect,
> Their starting locks *tangled with knots of vipers*?"

Verse 1039.—Ἄναξ Ἄπολλον, αἵδε πληθύουσι δή. Mr. Peile translates this noble verse by the following insufferably tame *remark*—the *ne plus ultra* of weak attempts to approach Aeschylean sublimity: "they are many indeed!" There is *only* one word in the English language which will at all express the Greek πληθύουσι in this passage; and upon that word neither Mr. Peile nor Potter have been fortunate enough to light—THEY SWARM!

We have now gone through the greater portion of the "Choephori," expressing ourselves freely, indeed, and perhaps sometimes strongly, but we sincerely trust neither uncourteously nor with unjust severity, upon passages, where either the notes or translations of the learned editor appear to us objectionable. That we have received little or no new light upon any of the numerous difficulties with which this play abounds—met with very few examples of ingenious emendation or acute criticism—and that we consequently think the benefits conferred upon the readers of Aeschylus by no means commensurate with the tedious prolixity of the accompanying commentary—we are compelled with regret to avow. In the last piece of the Orestean Trilogy, the "Eumenides," Mr. Peile will be destitute of the aid of his

guide and critical pioneer, the learned and ingenious, but too credulous and pertinacious, Klausen. There is much in that play which yet requires the hand of a master critic—one of better taste and judgment than Müller, and of more felicitous skill in emendation than either a Scholefield or a Peile. On the "Eumenides" there are many remarks which we would gladly make in the way of anticipative suggestion; but we refrain, through the polite wish to allow Mr. Peile the credit of certain restorations of the text, which, if he applies his well-stored mind seriously to the task, he will hardly fail to effect: and that he will favour the world with an edition (if somewhat less verbose, all the better) of a play which has, unhappily, not undergone the revising care of a Blomfield, is our anxious hope; and we shall hail his labours, we trust, with a heartier welcome than we have bestowed upon his "CHOEPHORI" OF AESCHYLUS.

ART. VIII.—*A Collection of Chants.* By ALFRED BENNETT, Organist of New College, Oxford.

2. *Cathedral Selections.* By THOMAS BENNETT, Organist of the Cathedral and St. John's Chapel, Chichester. London: Chappell and Co.

3. *Twenty-four Chants. To which are prefixed some Remarks on Chanting.* By ROBERT GRAY. Bellerby, York.

4. *The Psalter; arranged for Chanting.* By WILLIAM JONES, Organist of Ely Cathedral.

5. *Tunes for Country Churches; more especially adapted to the Selection of Psalms and Hymns compiled by the (late) Rev. Thomas Webster, B.D., Cambridge.* At the Pitt Press.

6. *The Psalm and Hymn Tunes used at St. John's Chapel, Bedford-row; arranged for Four Voices, and adapted for the Organ or Piano-forte, with appropriate Symphonies.* By THEOPHANIA CECIL. London: Cramer, Addison, and Neale.

IT has often been observed, and the observation has been made with only too much justice, that no part of the service of our Church has been more unaccountably and more totally neglected than the psalms and hymns which are put into the mouths of her members. While we express our necessities to our Heavenly Father, day after day and week after week, in the same forms of prayer from which our forefathers, now numbered among the Church triumphant, derived strength and

consolation, and which our brethren, still members of the Church militant, are continually offering up—the words in which we declare our admiration of his power, our gratitude for his mercies, our acknowledgment of his love, vary in almost every congregation throughout the kingdom. Hymns, containing every variety of doctrine, written by every class of men, are sung to every possible tune, and very frequently to no tune at all, and are interspersed through every part of the service, without any regard to propriety, or respect to the designs of the framers of our liturgy. In some congregations, a hymn is used at the opening of public worship; in others, it is inserted after the second lesson; it sometimes follows the collects; almost invariably succeeds the Litany and the Nicene Creed; and frequently is used immediately before—nay, we have heard it after—the blessing. Of these, the third seems to be the only position which is allowed by our rubrics: for the authority usually quoted for the first and the last—"For the comforting of such as delight in music, it may be permitted that, at the beginning or end of divine service, there may be sung a psalm, to the praise of Almighty God"—refers merely (as it has been well shown) to the singing; not when the congregation are assembled, but before they have arrived, or after they have departed; not as a part of public worship, but as the expression of private thankfulness. With respect to the introduction of a hymn after the second lesson, now unfortunately so usual, it is not only entirely irregular, but completely destroys the connexion between the lesson itself and the anthem which immediately follows it. It was a beautiful order which appointed, that, after we had heard some noble declaration of the power of that faith which overcometh the world—of the length, and breadth, and depth, and height of that love of Christ which passeth knowledge—of the glory of that resurrection in which the body, sown in dishonour and mortality, shall be raised to immortality and glory—we should join in the song of triumph, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." But this effect is entirely lost by the insertion, between the two, of a hymn, which may be quite at variance with the joyful spirit which should then animate our praises. And we have here a very fair example of the great danger incurred by the introduction of any novelty, lest we violate some unknown or overlooked principle.

Too much can hardly be said on the extreme irregularity involved by the introduction of the thousand "Selections of Psalms and Hymns" which teem through our parish churches.

A clergyman is hardly inducted into a cure of souls, especially if it be in a town, before he adds his collection to those which are already in use: and there are many inducements to such a course of action. In the first place, what the author considers the want—and we might call the non-existence—of a good collection of psalms and hymns; then the pleasure of publishing, which to many minds is exceedingly great; and the certainty of publishing without risk; because, if the selection be introduced into the parish church or chapel, the congregation must obtain it, or be content not to join in the hymns. As to the consumption of time and labour, the compilers seem ready to adopt the excuse of the German poet: "Chartarum autem jam demum miserere mapera, stultum, aut certe nimis serum est, ut qua sinè omni gratiâ ita perierunt hactenas et pereunt quotidie." And were this the whole mischief, the excuse might be accepted. But our Church has already authorized the use of two versions of the Psalms among her members; both, it is allowed, imperfect, and both falling very far short of the spirit of the original, yet both abounding in passages of more than ordinary beauty, and (inasmuch as they are translations of the word of God) containing no false doctrine, no principle of questionable orthodoxy. But how many of the hymns in our collections, while they fall infinitely short of the old and new versions in conveying nothing but simple and unalloyed truth, if viewed even in a poetical light, can be considered their equals? Let us glance at the five collections which have, and perhaps deservedly, obtained a more extended circulation than any others: we refer to "The Percy," "The St. John's," "The Cottage Hymn-book," the Rev. Charles Simeon's, and the Rev. Charles Bradley's. One might have expected that those whose words are to be the key-notes to the praises of future generations in the English Church, would be members who had lived and died in her communion; or, to extend our liberality as far as possible, writers who differed from her in no essential point of doctrine or discipline. But what is the case? Watts, and Doddridge, and Beddowe, and Baxter, and Wesley, and Whitefield, stand in strange juxtaposition with Ken and Jeremy Taylor: nor does the addition of the names of Pope and Dryden tend the better to assimilate the heterogeneous mass. Sentiments of all kinds, from the highest Calvinistic to the lowest Arminian tenets, are thus introduced into the same volume, and are sung "to the praise and glory" of Him who is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever." And, setting aside the palpable irreverence of addressing the God of Truth in forms of words, of which, if one be true, the other must be

false, what lax and half-formed notions must they be the means of impressing on the minds of the congregation who are in the habit of constantly using them, and in whose memories they will probably, from the very nature of verse, be more deeply infixed than will any other part of the service? To find, in one page, final perseverance asserted in the strongest and most dangerous light; in the next, the possibility of falling away after having received the truth, carried to an equal extreme: here, the doctrine of universal redemption; there, the awful, we had almost said, the blasphemous, idea that the God of Love has from all eternity predestined some of his creatures to everlasting misery: in this passage, the possibility of perfection in the present life; in that, expressions of self-abhorrence, carried to an almost anti-scriptural excess. What disturbing, what unsettling effects must they produce on the soul! And such is by no means an exaggerated picture of the contents even of those selections to which we have just adverted.

Much also might be said on the crude and meaningless compositions which go to swell the mass. Private friendship has dictated the insertion of many; the necessity of, by some means or other, forming a volume, that of more. And the portions which originally were of a higher character have been so transformed, to suit the fancy of successive editors, as hardly to retain any vestige of their primitive character. Now it is by no means necessary, nor perhaps expedient, that every faithful and zealous parish priest should to his other qualifications add that of a judge of poetical numbers and diction; and as it is not necessary, so it is not the case. Hence the low, and prosaic, and even ludicrous expressions, the feeble expletives and unmeaning doggrel of which, Wesley, in the preface to his hymns, as justly complains as he unjustly arrogates to himself the credit of having steered clear of them. Montgomery, in his introduction to the "Christian Psalmist," has described, somewhat severely, though with a good deal of truth, the manufacture of this class of compositions: "One line is written, because it is necessary to make a beginning; a second, in order to provide a rhyme for the first; a third, because a verse must consist of more than two lines; and a fourth, to complete the stanza. The same process is repeated several times, in order that the hymn may attain a suitable length."

The *simplest* way of getting rid of these anomalies and irregularities in our service, would be to confine the singing simply to the old and new versions of the Psalms: the *best*, in our opinion, would be to diminish the number of Psalms sung, and to endeavour to revert to the ancient practice of chanting. On

each of these subjects we shall offer some remarks; but we shall invert the above order, and speak first of chanting, and then of psalmody.

The chief objections made to the re-introduction of chanting into our churches are two—the want of reverence which is supposed to attach itself to it, and its difficulty.

Now that bad chanting must strike its auditors as in a high degree irreverent, although it be not so intended, cannot be denied. It may be added, that, when badly performed, it is worse than a psalm tune under similar circumstances. But to allow this, is only to allow, that "Corruptio optimi est pessim." And doubtless the general impression to the above effect has arisen from the manner in which the Gloria Patri, when chanted, as it often is, in our parish churches, is spoilt by an unskilful organist and uninstructed children. To hear one word slurred into another, particles and syllables omitted, accent and quantity disregarded, voices, instead of simultaneously pronouncing each word, hurrying onwards without any further design than that of accomplishing the verse in the shortest time possible—all this can give birth to no other sentiments than those of dislike and aversion. But we envy not his feelings who refuses to own, that the full chant in one of those cathedrals where attention has been paid to it—take, for example, Ely, or Lincoln, or York, or St. Paul's—impresses the mind with a degree of religious awe and solemnity which every other species of music fails to excite. There is such harmony, so much *keeping*, between it and the heaven-pointing arches, stoned windows, and fretted roof of a cathedral church, that it seems wonderful how any one can be unable at once to appreciate its propriety and beauty. Moreover, the full force of a psalm is frequently more vividly and powerfully illustrated by one chant, than by a thousand commentaries. Who that has ever heard it can forget the thrill, when in that magnificent hymn, the Creed of St. Athanasius, after the choir had solemnly and withal sweetly declared the belief of the Catholic Church in the doctrine of the most holy and undivided Trinity, and had testified that "the three Persons are co-eternal together," the organ swelled forth to adjoin, in its fullest volume of sound, the sublime words, "AND CO-EQUAL?" Can anything be more truly grand (imitated as it is from the great epic of music) than, in the Easter Anthem, when a low and plaintive strain has announced of the Saviour, "In that he died, he died unto sin once," the chorus triumphantly rejoins, "IN THAT HE LIVETH, HE LIVETH UNTO GOD?" And not only does the chant give greater beauty where some emphasis must previously have been felt, but it oftentimes calls

the attention to a sublime passage, which otherwise might have been entirely passed over. An instance occurs to us, which, though in a somewhat different species of music, will illustrate our meaning. How many have read, without feeling its grandeur, the first verse of the fourth chapter of the Revelation! But none who are acquainted with Stevenson's anthems can meditate on it without dwelling on the sublime sounds which opened the magnificent vision of the Apocalypse, the thrilling summons to "Come up hither," and the dim, and prophetic, and melancholy grandeur thrown over the words, "I will show thee things which must be hereafter."

If, then, it be irreverent to infuse fresh vividness and beauty into our perceptions of God's word, to free our minds from the apathy with which they are apt to contemplate that to which they are daily accustomed, by retaining the matter, but changing the manner, to render the penitential psalms more deeply pathetic, the joyful more triumphant, then may the system of chanting be considered as irreverent. Whatever else is brought against it, belongs not to its use, but to its abuse.

But a more plausible objection to the general use of chanting is its difficulty. It is all very well, its opponents urge, when used in a cathedral or collegiate church, where the choir are brought up to, and daily exercised in it: but the case is widely different in a village congregation, where voices cannot be selected, but must be taken as they are, and where little time, and less skill, for practice can be expected.

The chief difficulty, however, in our opinion, arises from the great ignorance which prevails on even the first principles of chanting. These we shall now endeavour to elucidate. We will imagine a village choir just formed, totally ignorant of the subject, and examine into the steps which would be necessary to render them competent to lead in such a manner as to increase the devotional fervour of the congregation.

We do not believe that a more admirable compendium of the principles of chanting exists than the introduction to the work which stands fifth on the list. It was designed for the use of the lower classes, and the simplicity and clearness with which its instructions are given render it highly valuable. We are compelled, however, to disagree with some of the divisions in the specimens there given. As it is highly desirable that, in these pattern psalms, the highest possible degree of accuracy should be obtained, we will note those which we consider capable of improvement. In the Venite:—

For—

For the Lord is - a - great - God;

we should prefer—

For the Lord - is a - great - God.

For—

And the strength of the - hi - lls - is - his - also;

we should prefer—

And the strength - of the - hills - is - his - also.

For—

And we are the people of his pasture, and the - she - ep - of - his - hand;

we should prefer—

And we are the people of his pasture, - and the - sheep - of - his - hand:

and so in the second verse of the Jubilate.

In the Magnificat, the division—

And my spirit hath re - joic - ed - in - God - my - Saviour,

is decidedly incorrect: it should be—

And my spirit hath re - joiced - in - God - my - Saviour.

We imagine

And hath ex - alt - ed - the humb - le and - meek,

to be a misprint: the division should be this—

And hath ex - alted - the - humble - and - meek.

As a specimen of the manner in which the teacher will find it expedient to proceed, we quote the opening remarks:—

"Chanting is the singing and articulating distinctly part of a sentence to one note, and the remainder to varied notes. Chants are of two kinds, single and double. A single chant consists of two strains, and is adapted to one verse of the psalm. A double chant consists of four strains, and is sung to two verses.

"Each strain of the chant consists of two parts. The first part usually contains only one note, called the *notching* or *chanting note;* the second contains several notes, and is called the *varied part* of the chant. Every verse to be chanted is divided into two sentences by a colon.

"All the syllables of the first sentence of the verse, with the exception of the three closing syllables, are sung to the *chanting* note: the *three closing* syllables are sung to the varied part. Thus the first verse of the Jubilate (the 100th Psalm) is divided into two sentences, the former of which is—

O be joyful in the Lord, - *all* - *ye* - *lands.*

Here the part in the Roman character is to be distinctly articulated, and sung to the chanting note; while the three last syllables are to be sung to the three corresponding varied notes. The second sentence of the verse is divided in a similar way, with only this difference, that the *five* closing syllables are reserved for the varied part, thus—

Serve the Lord with gladness, and come before his - *pre* - *sence* - *with* - *a* - *song.*

Here again the part in the Roman character is sung to the chanting note; while the five last syllables are sung to the varied part."

We feel sure that there is nothing in these directions which any child of common capacity would fail, with the smallest degree of attention, to understand. The writer then goes on to recommend that the books of the incipient choir should be marked, in order that the words and syllables may, when chanted, be simultaneously pronounced. And this, it may be remarked, is a matter of no great difficulty; the whole psalter may be marked in from eight to ten hours, and when one copy is finished the children may be made, each for himself, to arrange their own psalters from it. But here we are met by a difficulty. According to which of the four generally received systems—which may be called the Bangor, the Lincoln, the Canterbury, and the Norwich—is the division to be made? Mr. Gray, in the work which stands third in our notice, has given some specimens of each, but he has not entered with any depth into the reasons why one should be preferred above the other; indeed, his own system, which is that of York, appears not to coincide exactly with any.* We will first give a simultaneous view of the practice of all, and then enquire into the principles of each.

PSALM 20.

(*Verse* 1.)	*Chanting Note.*	1	2	3	4	5
Bangor.	The Lord hear thee	in the	day of	trouble		
Lincoln.	The Lord hear thee in the	day	of	trouble		
Canterbury	The Lord hear thee in the	day	of	trouble		
Norwich	The Lord hear thee in the day	of	trou	ble		
Bangor.	The name	of the	God of	Jacob	de	fend thee
Lincoln.	The name of the	God	of	Jacob	de	fend thee
Canterbury	The name of the God	of	Ja	cob	de	fend thee
Norwich	The name of the God of	Ja	cob	de	fend	thee
(*Verse* 2.)						
Bangor	Send thee	help	from the	sanctuary		
Lincoln	Send thee help	from	the	sanctuary		
Canterbury	Send thee help from the	sanct	u	ary		
Norwich	Send thee help from the sanct	u	a	ry		
Bangor	And	strengthen	thee	out	of	Sion
Lincoln.	And	strengthen	thee	out	of	Sion
Canterbury	And strength	en	thee	out	of	Sion
Norwich	And strengthen	thee	out	of	Si	on

* Of the twenty-four chants appended to this introduction we can say little in praise. The thirteenth strikes us as the only one which rises above mediocrity.

In order to determine the principles on which each of these systems are founded, and to decide between them, we must first observe, that were the metrical disposition of a chant to be prosodiacally marked, it would be expressed thus :—

A 1	A 2	A 3	A 4	B 1	B 2	B 3	B 4	B 5	B 6
–	–	⏑	–	–	–	⏑	–	⏑	–

Where A 1, B 1, are, of course, the chanting notes of the respective strains. For although in musical notations the notes A 2, A 3, are both marked as minims, as are also B 2, B 3, B 4, B 5, this must be considered rather as an arbitrary and fictitious arrangement than as determining the real quantity of the intermediate syllables: just as in the Old Hundredth, which is, to speak technically, Sambia Dimeter, the odd and even syllables are sung to notes of equal length, though the former are short and the latter long.

The chant thus constituted is precisely the same as an ordinary English heroic verse; and it is remarkable that the pause at A 4 was strictly observed by most of our earliest writers in heroic measure, excepting Chaucer. Gascoigne, in blank verse, and Stephen Hawes, in rhyme, may serve as examples; in both, indeed, the pause is marked by a comma, thus—

> Ther saw I eke, the palais of plesure
> Adornyd tharine, with golde and yvorye, &c.

A metrical division, which has been somewhat unnecessarily retained by the Laureate, in his edition of the "British Poets" from Chaucer to Jonson.

Taking the above, therefore, as our scheme, we will now enquire what resolutions the Canterbury, Bangor, and Lincoln systems allow; for the Norwich, as we have seen, confines itself strictly to the three and the five syllables. A tabular view may, perhaps, render the matter more intelligible:—

	A 1	A 2	A 3	A 4		B 1	B 2	B 3	B 4	B 5	B 6	
	–	–	⏑	–		–	–	⏑	–	⏑	–	
Bangor . . .		⏑ ⏑	⏑ ⏑	– ⏑			⏑ ⏑	⏑ ⏑	⏑ ⏑	⏑ ⏑	– ⏑	
				– ⏑	⏑						– ⏑	⏑
				– ⏑	⏑ ⏑						– ⏑	⏑ ⏑
Lincoln . .		⏑ ⏑		– ⏑			⏑ ⏑		⏑ ⏑		– ⏑	
				– ⏑	⏑						– ⏑	⏑
				– ⏑	⏑ ⏑						– ⏑	⏑ ⏑
Canterbury				–	⏑						–	⏑

From this it follows, that the Bangor principle is absolutely and decidedly unmetrical; since, in A 3, B 3, B 5, one short syllable is resolved into two short ones. In spite, therefore, of the advantages which its admirers, not without justice, attribute to it—such as the freedom and liveliness of its movements, the manner in which it shortens a chanting note of excessive length, and its general lightness—we have now only to decide between the three others.

The Norwich has, it must be confessed, several recommendations: it is probably the most ancient method; it is certainly the easiest; and there is a majesty about it which speaks strongly in its favour. But the violation of accent here, is almost worse than that of quantity in the Bangor, and so great as to be often painfully distressing to the ear. What, for example, can be more grating than the division—

As it were a ramping and - *ā - rŏar - ĭng - lĭ - ŏn* ?

Or—

Hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness - *ā - bŏve - thy - fĕl - lows* ?

There is also the disadvantage of the excessive number of syllables which must necessarily be thus crowded into the chanting note.

To remedy the violation of accent, so far as the last syllables are concerned, the Canterbury method steps in. But it is not very easy to see why, if the liberty of resolution be once allowed, it should not be extended, so far as can be done, without compromising the laws of metre. And it may be remarked, that this system is sometimes still more unaccentual than the former: for example—

And sent e - *vĭl - ăn - gĕls - ă - mong them,*

is worse than

And sent evil - *ān - gĕls - ā - mŏng - them.*

If we cannot gain more than this by the alteration, it were surely better to abide by the ancient method.

It is the Lincoln system alone, as we conceive, which completely reconciles the varying charms of accent and quantity. By no possible combination of words can it become unaccentual; and by a glance at our table it will be seen, that, as its resolutions only take place on a long syllable, the laws of metre are not violated.

It frequently happens, in this plan, that the resolution may take place either in B 2, or B 4. The question may be asked, which place is preferable? We conceive, that it should be thrown back as far as possible. Thus, we prefer—

That they should not - *enter - in - to - my - rest,*

to—

That they should not - *en - ter - into - my - rest;*

though both methods are, undoubtedly, equally correct.

We may notice one error most common among choirs which have been instructed in the Lincoln method. It is that of resolving one of the *short* syllables, which it is the particular beauty of the system to retain as they are. Thus, in the verse just quoted, how often do we hear the division—

That they should not - *en - ter in - to - my - rest.*

And the instructor will find, that, unless very much on his guard, the natural tendency of the voice will be to fall into this error.

We hope we shall be excused, if we answer one objection which may be brought against the metrical character of the system which we have been recommending. We are well aware that the above remarks may appear to some useless, and to others trifling; for ourselves, no labour bestowed in endeavouring to add to the solemnity and beauty of the service of God, appears to deserve either of those epithets. In order that the magnificent ritual of our cathedrals may continue (as they now do) to charm, to delight, to awe the worshipper, rules must be minutely laid down and accurately observed: the stately palace cannot rise, unless the slightest variation of the builder's plummet be noticed at its foundation. Surely, if those great and learned men who have bestowed many a laborious thought in elucidating the metrical difficulties of some heathen author, have, and that most justly, "had their reward," we may be forgiven for laying out an hour in a similar labour on the Psalms of David.

But to return to our subject. The question may be asked, how the resolutions in A 4, and B 6, can be metrical, since in both a long syllable is resolved into a Trochee, Dactyl, or even 1st Sæon? To this we answer, that the genius of our language allows, we might almost say favours, a supernumerary syllable at the end of a line. Of this, as is known to every one, we have an infinite number of examples in dramatic verse: and we believe that the nicest ear would consider the lines—

To be, or not to be: that is the question;

or—

A mount of snow fretted with golden pinnacles;

as perfectly satisfying in the sound as the most regular line of ten syllables. Thus much for the resolution in B 6, which is analogous to it: the analogy which defends that in A 4 is not so plain; but it exists no less. In our older dramatic poets, we frequently meet with a line of this kind—

My blessings on them! This day is blest indeed.

These are generally considered as irregular; but, in truth, we have here an example of the same resolution in the fourth foot which we have been considering in the tenth.

We will now for a moment glance at the cases in which one syllable must be carried on through two successive notes. These are two.

Firstly: it must be done where otherwise there will not be syllables enough to complete the strain. For example:—

B 1. B 2, 3. B 4. B 5. B 6.
Seek - *peace - and - en - sue it.*

B 1. B 2, 3, 4. B 5. B 6.
Shall - *have - great - trouble.*

It is frequently a perplexing thing to know which syllable to treat thus: as a general rule, it may be proper to take that immediately following the chanting note, unless the emphasis demands that the lengthened syllable be the chanting note itself. As in the anthem for the "Commemoration of King Charles the Martyr:"—

A 1. A 2. A 3. A 4.
The fool counted his life madness, and his end to be *with - out - honour.*

B 1, 2. B 3. B 4. B 5. B 6.
But - *he - is - in - peace;*

or, which we should prefer—

B 1, 2, 3. B 4. B 5. B 6.
But - *he is - in - peace.*

For here the whole emphasis must be laid on the particle, which contrasts the ignominy under which the martyr suffered here, and the glorious triumph which awaited him above.

Secondly: it must be done sometimes, though rarely, on account of the accent. There is a very frequent termination, of which the collocation of words, "the house of the Lord," may be considered as a type. Now the article not being strong enough to bear the citus of B 2, we must, if it be possible, effect a resolution, thus:—

B 1. B 2. B 3. B 4. B 5. B 6.
I am cast out - *of the - sight - of - thine - eyes*

Otherwise we must divide the following syllable:—

B 1. B 2, 3. B 4. B 5. B 6.
From the - *ground - of - the - heart.*

We should observe, before quitting the subject, that our nomenclature is not that *always*, though it be frequently, employed. Thus Mr. Gray calls that which we designate as the Norwich, by the title of the Lincoln, &c.

We have hitherto refrained from noticing Mr. Jones's division of the psalter, in order that our readers may be the better able

to enter into our reasons for not recommending it to them. Mr. Jones, who is the organist of Ely Cathedral, and with whose admirable training of the choir we have frequently had occasion to be delighted, was, we believe, a pupil of the Norwich school. On his removal to his present appointment the idea struck him that, by printing an edition of the psalms marked for chanting, he might be the means of introducing a greater uniformity over the kingdom: * and the result was the present volume, which made its appearance under the patronage of the dean and chapter. The design, we are compelled to say, is far superior to the execution: for the Lincoln system, while it is taken as the bass, is frequently violated in some of its most essential features. We meet, also, with frequent instances of a licence not *generally* allowed in the Bangor method (we have heard it at Chester)—the introduction of a trisyllable with varied notes. Thus we find Psalm xxvii. 15, thus divided:—

A 1. A 2. A 3. A 4.
I should - *utterly* - *have* - *fainted:*

a practice, which, to our ear, entirely destroys all rhythm whatever, and reduces the system to little better than a legalized confusion.

Another objection to the work is the perplexing manner in which the divisions are given; † and its inconvenient size and dearness will almost of themselves forbid its introduction into a village school: though the instructor may find it useful to provide himself with a copy.

We will now imagine the psalters marked, the choir instructed in the principles which are to guide them, and all other preliminary steps taken. The last thing to be considered is, what collection of chants to employ.

The two most generally known are Dr. Beckwith's and that which stands first on our list. In the former, the plan is adopted of affixing a chant to each psalm. Dr. Beckwith was organist of Norwich; and to him, and to Mr. Z. Buck, his worthy successor, the present excellent state of that choir may be attributed. But a very serious objection to this collection is, that three-fourths of the chants are single; that too many were written by Dr. Beckwith and Dr. Hayes, for the occasion; that

* We are not sure, however, that we should be glad were the present systems of the various cathedrals abrogated, in order to make way for one uniform method. They have probably, in most cases, descended traditionally from before the Reformation; and therefore, even where incorrect, deserve reverence from their age. This does not prevent our equally desiring, that, where a new choir is formed, the best system should be alone introduced.

† Burns has just published a smaller and cheaper edition, thereby obviating the latter objection; but the former still hold good.

many excellent double ones of that time are omitted; and that no second edition has been published which might incorporate those of a later date.

The other work which we mentioned is such as no lover of sacred music should be without: and it is, in fact, its very goodness which puts it above being fitted for such a choir as we are imagining. A division for four voices is not wanted here, and will only be perplexing: moreover, the variety of chants will distract the mind, and be decidedly productive of a bad effect.

We think that among the thousand similar collections there is none we could, on the whole, recommend above Mr. Thomas Bennett's "Cathedral Selections." They contain thirty double and twenty-eight single chants (most of the latter we could, indeed, have dispensed with), several "commandments" and "Sanctuses," and a few easy anthems. The price of the work is only five shillings; so that it might be dispersed among those persons in the better classes of the parish to whom it might be useful, and whom it would enable with ease to join in chanting the psalms. Yet several beautiful chants are omitted, which we should be sorry were not generally known. Perhaps we shall be conferring a favour on some of our readers if we mention a few of those which we should recommend; and particularize also some of the psalms to which they are adapted:—

Lord Mornington, in E; Russell, in E; Dupens, in A; Crotch's two, in C; Jones (which Haydn is said to have considered one of the most sublime musical ideas he knew) may be used for almost any psalm; so may also Boyce's two well known chants.

A. Bennett's Minor is adapted most beautifully for any of the penitential psalms. If, however, it should be considered too difficult, its place may be tolerably supplied by Alcock.

For Psalms	29, 37, 90, 107	Beckwith.
	68	Calah.
	20, 21, 72	Soaper.
	39	Goss, from Beethoven.
	34, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150,	Chard.
	136, 137	Ebdon, followed by Alcock, or Chard, „ by Purcell.
	103	Lemon.
	121, 122, 123, 124, 125 . .	Heathcote.
	132	Slater.
	16, 27, 55, 66, 74, 79 . .	Cooke.
	46	Morley.
	8, 19, 93, 94, 97, 99, 100 .	The Grand Chant.
	69	Robert Cooke.
	104, 105, 106, 108 . . .	Handel and Parnell.
	56, 57, 58	Kent and Hayes.

The foregoing may serve as specimens of the manner in which it is desirable to connect psalms with chants.

It is much to be lamented that so many beautiful chants, buried in the recesses of our cathedral organ lofts, should be entirely lost. We are ourselves in possession of several compositions by Ebdon, now preserved at Durham, which, were it allowed, would well repay the trouble and expense of publication. In fact, there is hardly a choir which does not possess some MS. chants that it would confer no small obligation on the lovers of sacred music to render more widely known. And this system of concealment is the more deeply to be regretted, because, so far as respects cathedral music, our lot is certainly thrown among "the days of little men." Exceptions here and there may be found; but the Camidges, the Walmisleys,* the Turles, the Bennetts, of our times, but ill supply the place of the Cookes, the Boyces, the Kents, the Hayeses, of former years.

We might, did time allow it, dwell on the careless manner in which the musical part of the service is performed in many of our cathedrals. The fines for the non-attendance of the choristers are not exacted; the organist too often permits his place to be filled up by a deputy; the selection of chants, services, and anthems, are frequently left almost to chance. But we have already lingered so long over this part of our subject that we must hasten to offer a few very brief observations on the psalm tunes most commonly in use.

The two collections which stand at the head of this article may serve as very good specimens of the different methods in which psalm tunes (as bearing respect for the different classes for whom they are intended) should be arranged. The former, to quote the words of the compiler, are such as are—

"Commonly sung in the churches of Cambridge and its vicinity. They have been used for several years in the parish church of Oakington, by a village congregation, sometimes without any accompaniment, and at others with only the aid of a flute, clarionet, or violoncello; and it is therefore presumed that they may be introduced without difficulty into other country congregations.

"The selector of tunes, and the leader of devotional harmony, has no easy task to perform. He must often yield that he may overcome; and must concede much in order that he may secure the assistance of

* Having mentioned Professor Walmisley's name, we may express our regret that he does not make public some of his sacred compositions. We consider him as (not excepting Camidge) the first chant writer of the present day; those who have heard them will not soon forget his "Quadruple" for the seventy-eighth Psalm, and his beautiful "Answer" to Goss, from Beethoven.

those, without whose aid psalmody cannot be congregational. Where the psalmody is conducted by a skilful organist, and a well-trained choir, the difficulty of selecting appropriate tunes is materially diminished; and it may fairly be expected that no composition should be introduced which is not arranged on scientific principles, and adapted to a refined ear. Yet, even in many metropolitan churches, the psalmody is almost confined to the shrill treble of the school children; while, in numerous instances, large congregations unite, as with one voice, in tunes which a cultivated taste would decidedly condemn..... Considerations of this kind have induced the compiler to admit some tunes, which, under other circumstances, would not have been inserted, and to omit others, which, though admirable in themselves, are not generally acceptable."

There is, doubtless, much that is true in the above remarks; yet, at the same time, we are of opinion, that the principle has been, in the work before us, carried rather too far. No consideration whatever would have induced us to admit such tunes as "Cambridge New," and the "Sicilian Mariners;" the former, better adapted to lead a country dance than to excite any devotion; and the latter, a sickly, sentimental, and languishing air, the author of which happily remains in that obscurity which he richly merits. We do not believe—at least, not to the extent which the passage we have just quoted seems to intimate—in the natural vitiations of musical taste which is imputed to our country congregations; we are rather inclined to think that any tune, of which the air is strikingly marked, will win their favour, simply because it is not beyond their power of comprehension. It is true that "Cambridge New" is very popular; but we believe "Magdalene" (the Evening Hymn), which, be it Tallis's or no, is certainly the work of a master, to be still more so; and both from the reason we have just given.

The whole volume contains eighty-eight psalm tunes, besides ten chants. Miss Cecil's volume is, as we have seen, arranged for four voices: the number of tunes it contains is thirty-nine; of which eight, namely, St. Margaret's, St. Clement's, St. Jerome's, St. Lawrence's, St. Bernard's, St. John's, St. Ambrose's, and St. Austin's, are the production of the Rev. Richard Cecil; and three, St. Tulsa's, St. Ignatius's, and St. Catharine's, of the compiler herself. This is, perhaps, rather too large a proportion of original compositions; though, at the same time, we are bound to own that they are most of them well worthy of the place they hold, and St. Austin's and St. Margaret's may be considered first-rate in the class to which they belong.

A peculiarity in the manner of arrangement may be noticed in the words of the introduction:—

"It has been suggested, by some friends, that preludes and interludes

annexed to the tunes would render the volume more acceptable; some have, therefore, been attempted, which may serve as hints for the extemporary performer to improve upon. These, however, being written with a view rather to private than public performance, are not, in every instance, confined to the gravity and brevity required in congregational singing. Whatever of this nature intermingles itself with the praises of God, if not exceedingly chastised in style and length, seems an unjustifiable interruption of the worship of the Church."

It is a circumstance worthy of notice, that in the multifarious collection of Rippon, probably not twenty psalm tunes could be pointed out, whose composers were distinguished for musical genius. The Rev. R. Cecil, of Long Stanton, Cambridgeshire, in a collection which he not long ago published, endeavoured to arrange the more celebrated airs under four classes, according to their various degrees of excellence. Without attempting so minute a scale, we think that those which may be fairly considered as of a first-rate character would not form a very long list. When we have named Burford, St. Margaret's, St. Anne's, St. Stephen's, the Evening Hymn, the Old Hundredth, Truro, Hanover, Haydn's, Hotham, Milton, St. Austin's, Tantum ergo, Adesté Fideles, Portsmouth, and Salzburg, we are not aware that we shall have been guilty of any material omission.*

The manner in which the psalmody is usually managed in our village congregations is a subject which it is painful to contemplate. An old man, who receives his forty shillings a year as clerk, in order that forty shillings a year may be spared to the parish books, is the person usually selected to lead the thanksgivings of the congregation; or, if he be assisted at all, it is by a full accompaniment of violin, violoncello, clarionet, and flute (and well if there be not some noisier instrument of music), from the village band, sufficient to banish every idea of melody from the minds of those who might otherwise take a part in the singing. Tunes of the most improper and ludicrous character are too frequently admitted: it is not many months since, in a church in Sussex, we heard the hymn attempted—the attempt was, we admit, a failure—to the tune of "Here's a health to all good lasses;" and we have more than once known "Jenny Jones" employed in a church as a psalm tune. Surely

* We are sorry to find Milton (composed by our great poet) excluded from both these collections. Why it is so from the St. John's we cannot divine; and if it be banished from the Oakington, because, "though admirable in itself, it is not likely to be generally acceptable," we know not why Burford was retained. We think that were the "Ave Reginæ Cælorum" harmonized to suit the measure, eights and sevens, a great obligation would be conferred on English psalmody.

some efficient steps should be taken against the occurrence of such disorders as are these.

We hope that the above remarks may possess some degree of utility, for those who are anxiously endeavouring to bring about so desirable a result as the banishment of these and similar irregularities. The complete eradication of the present evils attendant on our system of psalmody, cannot be looked for till it becomes matter of consideration to those in authority. But much may be done by individual clergymen, each in the service of the church over which he is set, so to arrange and direct the public worship of God, that, to a far greater extent than is now the case, we may "with one mind and one mouth glorify Him."

ART. IX.—*Tracts for the Times, No.* 90.—*Remarks on certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles.* London: Rivingtons. 1841.

2. *A Letter addressed to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, in explanation of No.* 90, *in the Series called "The Tracts for the Times."* By the AUTHOR. Oxford: Parker. 1841.

3. *A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, on the publication of No.* 90, *of the "Tracts for the Times."* By WILLIAM SEWELL, M.A., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford. Oxford: Parker. 1841.

IT may, perhaps, be expected that we should assign some reason for again entering into a controversy which for more than a year past we have tacitly declined; and we think that the turn which affairs have taken at Oxford, in reference to the "Tracts for the Times," of so much consequence, and likely to lead to results so important, as not merely to justify but to demand the renunciation of our purpose.

But inasmuch as we have ourselves been *honoured* by Lord Morpeth with long quotations in the House of Commons (his Lordship seeking, under shelter of our authority, to prop up a cause which we abhor), and inasmuch as those quotations have been either re-echoed or commented upon by the most distinguished portions of the newspaper press, it may be necessary, before again touching on the Tracts, to say a few words as to the part taken by this Review in the controversy.

A change took place in the management previous to April, 1840, since which period—and not since January, 1840, as has been sometimes supposed—the Review has been in the hands

of the present editor. On what may have been written in this periodical before April, 1840, we shall make no remark, save that we do not hold ourselves responsible for it. Of the correctness of our present course, the increasing circulation and increasing utility of the Review afford us satisfactory evidence.

We have uniformly objected to the tone and tendency of the Tracts, while we have as uniformly both believed well and spoken in terms of Christian courtesy of their writers. At the same time, however, that we have thus expressed our disapprobation of the Tracts, we had no hesitation in allowing that as yet they have met with no competent opponents.

In the early part of March appeared No. 90 of this celebrated series, bearing the title "Remarks on certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles."

Now though we had carefully watched the progress of the Tracts, and had observed the increasing boldness of their strides towards Rome, we certainly were not prepared for such assertions as we found in No. 90 :—

"We may dispense with the phrase 'Rule of Faith,' as applied to Scripture, on the ground of its being ambiguous,"—(p. 8). And afterwards: "Perhaps its use had better be avoided altogether. In the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture, it is plain, is *not*, on Anglican principles, the Rule of Faith."—(p. 11).

There is, undoubtedly, *a sense* in which this is true; and we are quite aware that in that sense did Mr. Newman write it: but he ought to have known that his words *would* be misunderstood and *must* be mischievous. Most injudicious are such violent attacks upon established ideas, merely to correct a phrase which everybody understands.

Take another instance :—

"Now the first remark that occurs on perusing this article is, that the doctrine objected to is the *Romish doctrine*. For, indeed, no one would suppose that the *Calvinistic* doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, and image worship, is spoken against."—(p. 23).

Certainly not, because, first, Calvin was not of sufficient note when the Article was drawn up, to impress his opinion upon its framers. On this point, Mr. Newman may consult Archbishop Lawrence. Secondly, because the Church intended to condemn, "*in toto*," the doctrine *that asserted*—not the doctrine that *denied*—a purgatory. But let us hear Mr. Newman again :—

"None of these doctrines (the Primitive, the Catholic, the Tridentine, and the one maintained by the Greeks at Florence, having just been enumerated) does the Article condemn; any of them may be held by the Anglo-Catholic as a matter of private belief."—(p. 25).

Now on this topic we have a word or two to say before we

go further. In the strictly primitive Church there was *no* doctrine of purgatory, because the idea had not suggested itself. In the time of St. Augustine, we find that great and good man condemning the doctrine, that there was any future state save heaven and hell; by which we learn, that in his day the doctrine of purgatory (*i. e.*, the doctrine which asserted purgatory) began to be taught; and the learned Bishop of Hippo pronounced it to be heretical. But inasmuch as our Church condemns the same doctrine, viz., the assertion of purgatory, and the *Romish* doctrine of purgatory, *because of its assertive character*, we have no difficulty in concluding that the Anglo-Catholic may *not* hold any of the doctrines which Mr. Newman here enumerates.

On the subject of the *invocation of saints*, Mr. Newman observes:—

"Judging from two examples set us in the Homilies themselves, invocations are not censurable, and certainly not 'fond,' if we mean nothing definite by them, addressing them to beings which we know cannot hear, and using them as interjections."—(p. 36).

That is to say, so far as we understand him, that we may pray to the saints if we do not mean anything by it, and are quite sure when we *do* pray that the saints in question do not hear us. We should like also to be informed what is meant in the last line by "*them*"—whether, viz., we are to use *our prayers*, or *the saints*, as interjections? The construction of the sentence seems to indicate the latter. The truth of the matter is, that there is *nothing definite* in the whole system of the Tractarian.

Once more, with regard to *transubstantiation*:—

"Let them believe and act on the truth that the consecrated bread is Christ's body, as he says, and no officious comment will be attempted by any well-judging mind. But when they say, 'this cannot be true, because it is impossible,' then they force those who think it *literally* true, to explain how, according to their notions, it is not impossible. And those who ask hard questions must put up with hard answers."—(p. 58).

On this we can only say, that had Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer been able to say half as much as this, the fires of martyrdom would never have been lighted for them. Mr. Newman insists, in this Tract, on a *bodily* presence of Christ in the eucharist, and argues very subtilly about a real presence being very possible without a local presence, forgetting, or not choosing to remember, that the Anglican Church speaks throughout of a *spiritual* presence.

A similar line of argument is adopted with regard to masses:

"Nothing can shew more clearly than this passage (a part of Article 31) that the Articles are not written against the creed of the Church of Rome, but against actual existing errors in it, whether

taken into its system or not. Here the sacrifice of the *mass* is not spoken of, in which the special doctrine would be introduced, but the sacrifice of *masses*"—(p. 59). And again: "On the whole, then, it is conceived that the Article before us neither speaks against the *mass* in itself, nor against its being an offering for the quick and the dead for the remission of sin."—(p. 63).

Surely this needs no comment.

In fine, it appears, from this notable No. 90, that an Anglican Catholic may believe in purgatory, pardons, the veneration of images and relics—may invoke the saints (provided always that they do not hear him, and that he has no definite meaning in his invocation)—may believe that there are seven sacraments; that the mass is a sacrifice for the quick and dead for the remission of sins, that the Church has a right to forbid the marriage of the clergy, and that our forefathers were right in obeying the Pope—may believe in transubstantiation and *disbelieve the Homilies;* and, after all, be a very sound member of the Anglican Church Catholic. We pronounce this HERESY!

In the same light it appeared to not a few of the most eminent members of the University; the whole body was in a state of agitation—nothing was talked of but the new Tract, and it would seem that, save a few of the more youthful disciples of the school, the Tractarian party felt that their experiment had been a hazardous one, and that as yet the public mind was but ill-prepared for so full an exposition of their views.

A few days after the appearance of No. 90, a call was made on the Editor of the Tracts, for the name of the Author of that last published. It should be observed, that there was never any Editor of the "Tracts for the Times;" a certain number of persons wrote what, and at what intervals, they chose.

The following is the letter to which we refer:—

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.'

"Sir,—Our attention having been called to No. 90 in the series of 'Tracts for the Times,' *by members of the University of Oxford,* of which you are the editor, the impression produced on our minds by its contents is of so painful a character, that we feel it our duty to intrude ourselves briefly on your notice. This publication is entitled 'Remarks on certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles;' and as these Articles are appointed by the statutes of the University to be the text-book for tutors in their theological teaching, we hope that the situations we hold in our respective colleges will secure us from the charge of presumption in thus coming forward to address you.

"The Tract has, in our apprehension, a highly dangerous tendency, from its suggesting that certain very important errors of the Church of Rome are not condemned by the Articles of the Church of England; for instance, that those Articles do not contain any condemnation of the doctrines—

"1. Of purgatory,
"2. Of pardons,
"3. Of the worshipping and adoration of images and relics,
"4. Of the invocation of saints,
"5. Of the mass,

as they are taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome; but only of certain absurd practices and opinions, which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as we do. It is intimated, moreover, that the declaration prefixed to the Articles, so far as it has any weight at all, sanctions this mode of interpreting them, as it is one which takes them in their 'literal and grammatical sense,' and does not 'affix any new sense' to them. The Tract would thus appear to us to have a tendency to mitigate, beyond what charity requires, and to the prejudice of the pure truth of the Gospel, the very serious differences which separate the Church of Rome from our own, and to shake the confidence of the less learned members of the Church of England in the scriptural character of her formularies and teaching.

"We readily admit the necessity of allowing that liberty in interpreting the formularies of our Church which has been advocated by many of its most learned bishops and other eminent divines; but this Tract puts forward new and startling views as to the extent to which that liberty may be carried. For, if we are right in our apprehension of the author's meaning, we are at a loss to see what security would remain, were his principles generally recognised—that the most plainly erroneous doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome might not be inculcated in the lecture-rooms of the University and from the pulpits of our churches.

"In conclusion, we venture to call your attention to the impropriety of such questions being treated in an anonymous publication, and to express an earnest hope that you may be authorised to make known the writer's name. Considering how very grave and solemn the whole subject is, we cannot help thinking, that both the Church and the University are entitled to ask, that some person, besides the printer and publisher of the Tract, should acknowledge himself responsible for its contents. We are, Sir, your obedient humble servants,

"T. T. Churton, M.A., Vice-Principal and Tutor of Brasenose.
"H. B. Wilson, B.D., Fellow and Senior Tutor of St. John's.
"John Griffiths, M.A., Sub-Warden and Tutor of Wadham.
"A. C. Tait, M.A., Fellow and Senior Tutor of Baliol.

"Oxford, March 8th."

On this letter, published in the *Times* of March 10, the editor of that powerful journal makes the following remarks:—

"We insert, from its official character, a paper signed by four tutors of colleges at Oxford, calling upon the editor of one of the most bruited 'Tracts, No. 90,' to declare who is the author of that and other productions of a similar character.

"If this demand be made with a view to any ulterior proceedings of a legal character at the University or other ecclesiastical court, we, with no predilection for the authors of these Tracts, advise the movers of

such measures against them to desist, and to be content with refuting their errors in fair literary controversy. They may otherwise involve the University itself in considerable trouble."

In these remarks we willingly concur; but we do not for a moment imagine that the object of the four tutors was to institute legal proceedings of *any kind*, but simply to withdraw from a Tract which they rightly consider most mischievous, the *corporate authority* of Drs. Pusey and Hook, Messrs. Newman and Keeble, ET ALII, and to show it in its intrinsic character as the private opinion of some Mr. A. or Mr. B. We are not anxious to defend the phraseology of the letter, upon which the *Times* is very severe, but we look at it as a very remarkable instance of uncompromising principle. Those who know aught of modern Oxford must be well aware how overwhelming is the force of public opinion there; not the opinion of the world at large, nor even of the British empire at large, but of the University. There are not less than fifty tutors in that University, and yet when a Tract makes its appearance emanating from, though not authorized by, the University, and in the highest degree dangerous and objectionable, four only out of the fifty take any steps towards stripping it of its *adventitious authority*. We do not hesitate to say, that the cause of this backwardness on the part of others is *a growing dread of responsibility*—a feeling most opposed to all real advance, and by no means in accordance with properly understood Church principles.

The four tutors boldly cast aside this feeling, and did what they considered their duty, even though it entailed upon them an extra portion of responsibility. This appeal met with no reply; it was made on the 8th of March, and after the lapse of a week the Hebdomadal Board took up the matter, and passed a censure expressly upon No. 90 of the Tracts, and, by implication, upon the rest. This has been said to be "a contemptuous document," because it speaks of the Tracts as "purporting to be written by members of the University, but which are in no way sanctioned by the University itself." Now it should be remembered, first, that the Hebdomadal Board could only speak of the Tracts as what *they purported to be;* for otherwise it would be inferred that the Board had *official* information as to the authors, and this would have implied, if not a sanction, at least a cognizance on the part of the University. And, secondly, that it is impossible to convey a reproof in language which shall at the same time imply the utmost reverence. Reproof implies a superiority in the reprover over the person reproved; and the Board intended to condemn the then anonymous author of the Tract as a disturber of the Church, and a teacher of heresy. But our readers shall judge for themselves.

"*At a Meeting of the Vice Chancellor, Heads of Houses, and Proctors, in the Delegates' Room, March 15th,* 1841.

"Considering that it is enjoined in the statutes of this University (Tit. 3, sect. ii.; Tit. 9, sect. ii. § 3, sect. v. § 3), that every student shall be instructed and examined in the Thirty-nine Articles, and shall subscribe to them; considering also that a Tract has recently appeared, dated from Oxford, and entitled 'Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles,' being No. 90 of the 'Tracts for the Times,' a series of anonymous publications, purporting to be written by members of the University, but which are in no way sanctioned by the University itself;

"*Resolved*, that the modes of interpretation, such as are suggested in the said Tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they are designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance, of the above-mentioned statutes.

"P. WYNTER, Vice Chancellor."

No sooner was this resolution announced than Mr. Newman acknowledged himself the Author of the Tract, and addressed to the Vice Chancellor a letter, which is certainly one of the most remarkable documents we ever saw published: we subjoin it, premising that the italics are our own, and particularly directing the reader's attention to the passages so distinguished:—

"Mr. Vice Chancellor,—I write this respectfully to inform you that I am the author, and have the sole responsibility, of the Tract on which the Hebdomadal Board has just now expressed an opinion, and that I have not given my name hitherto, *under the belief that it was desired that I should not.* I hope it will not surprise you if I say, that my opinion remains unchanged of the truth and honesty of the principle maintained in the Tract, and of the necessity of putting it forth. At the same time, I am prompted by my feelings to add my deep consciousness that *everything I attempt might be done in a better spirit, and in a better way;* and, while I am sincerely sorry for the trouble and anxiety I have given to the members of the Board, I beg to return my thanks to them for an act which, *even though founded on misapprehension,* may be made as profitable to myself as it is religiously and charitably intended.

"*I say all this with great sincerity*, and am,

"Mr. Vice Chancellor, your obedient servant,

"JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

"Oriel College, March 16th, 1841."

Many remarks have been made about the style of these letters. We candidly acknowledge that we *never* met with more slipshod language than that which they *all* display; perhaps Mr. Sewell bears away the palm of inelegance and inaccuracy, but he hardly equals Mr. Newman in obscurity. Well may Mr. Sewell say, speaking of No. 90—

"But I wish most distinctly and emphatically to state, that I am describing only the impression on my own mind, and not presuming to assert that I have caught the real meaning of the author. If I am mistaken, it will be a subject of great satisfaction; and the fact of my own misconception may prove an apology for others who may have been similarly misled with myself."—(p. 4).

And now, having said thus much on the question of style, we proceed with the history of the Tracts: and there are some remarks, or rather there is a tone in some remarks, of Mr. Newman, in his letter to the Vice Chancellor, that cannot be passed over without comment. We think few men accustomed to the world would hesitate to translate the letter as follows:—

Mr. Vice Chancellor,—You have, by a great overstep of your authority, condemned a Tract upon which neither you nor those who sat with you are qualified to judge. As it now appears unavoidable, I send you my name, rather to prevent damage to "the cause," by allowing the Tract to which you object to remain on the same corporate authority as do the rest of the Tracts, than out of any deference to the University. At the same time, as, by reason of your position, you and the other members of the board are, in one respect, my ecclesiastical superiors, I feel that I ought to submit myself to your authority; but lest you should suppose that submission to be any more than a form, I make it so excessive as to reveal to you, and all who may read it, the real state of my mind: I therefore inform you that *all* that I do might be done in a much better way, and in a much better spirit. I am, indeed, a very wicked sinner; yet permit me to say, that wicked as I am, I conceive myself, in the present instance, to have been perfectly right.

I hope you will not take fire at the ill-concealed irony of this letter; but lest you should be inclined so to do, I conclude with thanking you for your condemnation, and assuring you that I do it with very great sincerity.

And am, &c.

We do not say that all this is to be found *totidem verbis*, but this is the spirit and tenor of Mr. Newman's unparalleled epistle. He followed up this by addressing a letter to Dr. Jelf, canon of Christ Church, vindicating the views put forth in the Tract; and *so far* allowable, as it is done in a way by no means offensive. But he intersperses this vindication with occasional sneers at the four tutors who demanded his name, and uniformly calls them, in too evident contempt, "the four gentlemen." Mr. Newman speaks much of the "necessity" for the Tracts in general, and for No. 90 in particular. We confess that, with the French judge—

"Nous n'en voyons pas la necessité."

But we will borrow the words of an esteemed contemporary, who throws a strong light upon the subject:—

"The 'necessity' supposed to be meant by him is said to be, that

certain of his followers began to feel themselves obliged to go over to the Roman Catholics, and he therefore took rather a bolder line than hitherto, to enable them to satisfy themselves without leaving the Church of England. I should imagine that his method, instead of stopping the few, will hasten the many. It is quite certain that ardent imaginations, over inflamed with the views that he suggests they may indulge in with impunity, will not content themselves with the withered and shrunken Popery that he would fain substitute in the place of our scriptural Church and sound moderation of religious views. It is expected that another more formal reply will be issued by the party. The chief objection to Mr. N.'s letter is the assertion of the 'honesty of the principle,' for this must apply to the principle of interpretation. If there was a necessity of his publishing the Tract, it is a necessity of his own making, or of the party's imagining, and is only a still stronger proof of the dangerous effects of the principles which have been so long advocated in an under-current."

These remarks, which, referring as they do to *motives*, and not to facts, can only be matter of conjecture, receive strong confirmation from Mr. Newman's own words in his letter to Dr. Jelf:—

"In truth, there is at this moment a great progress of the religious mind of our Church to something *deeper and truer than satisfied the last century*. I always have contended, and will contend, that it is not satisfactorily accounted for by any particular movements of individuals on a particular spot. The poets and philosophers of the age have borne witness to it many years. Those great names in our literature, *Sir Walter Scott*, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Coleridge, though in different ways and with essential differences one from another, and perhaps from any Church system, still all bear witness to it. Mr. Alexander Knox, in Ireland, bears a most surprising witness to it. The system of Mr. Irving is another witness to it. The age is moving towards something, and most unhappily the one religious communion among us which has of late years been practically in possession of this something *is the Church of Rome*. She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of *awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may be especially called Catholic*. The question then, is, whether we shall give them up to the Roman Church or claim them for ourselves, as we well may, by reverting to that older system, which has of late years indeed been superseded, but which has been, and is quite congenial (to say the least), I should rather say proper and natural, or even necessary, to our Church. But if we do give them up, then we must give up the men who cherish them. We must consent either to give up the men, or to admit their principles."

We would adopt Mr. Sewell's newly-found modesty, and confess that we do not clearly understand all that Mr. Newman writes, nor even all the passage that we have quoted; but the tendency of it seems to be, that the Church of England, as at present constituted, with her creeds, her liturgy, her homilies, and her articles, is not sufficient to satisfy *the age*—

and as *the age* must be satisfied, we must either Romanize or renounce the Anglican Church.

So does Mr. Sewell understand this very sophistical letter, and we shall gladly array his authority against both it and the Tracts. He says, in his letter to Dr. Pusey:—

"But on a careful and repeated perusal of the Tract, it did to my own mind convey intimations, which, if unintentionally suggested through incautious expressions, would still, at such a moment as the present, be most deeply to be lamented; and if intended, must be open to considerable discussion, and I will add, in my own view, to the gravest objections."

We shall make one or two more quotations from Mr. Sewell, before we advert to his recorded approval of the Tracts up to No. 90. He says:—

"And it is now, too, become evident, that the continuation of the Tracts, at least in their present shape, may lead to painful collisions, not with persons incompetent to judge, but with authorities, whom we must all respect." Again:—

"Farther, it was difficult not to infer the contemplation in the mind of the writer of some future and unexplained changes in the external system of the Church. It is guarded, indeed, with certain conditions for the present, but with such as seem by no means sufficient to allay or restrain the natural discontent, and tendency to rash, restless reform, which must be created by the language in which the present condition of the Church is described; not as regards the sins of her individual members (for in this no change can be enforced too earnestly), but in her 'formularies,' 'precedents,' and 'principles.' If the 'body of death,' which we are now said to bear about, is applied to her system as established in 'uncatholic times,' such is surely not the tone in which our greatest divines have been accustomed to speak of the Church of England, especially as distinguished from the Church of Rome."

This is decided enough, and we rejoice to see it; but we shall see more before the close of the letter:—

"If (says the Professor) you ask me why I have thought it necessary to say thus much, one reason is, that although I have never, as you know, been in the slightest degree connected with the publication of the Tracts, and have always studiously avoided habits of intimacy with their authors, as fearing the creation of a party, I was once, as you have stated to me yourself, the means, under Providence, of considerably allaying the irritation and alarm which had been raised against you and others, by false and silly charges."

We now turn to Mr. Sewell's personal connection with the Tracts. It is quite true that he wrote not one of them; that he was not on terms of intimacy with Mr. Newman, we readily believe. But what is the object of Mr. Sewell, and what is the effect of his disclaimer?

He evidently wishes to be ranked among the anti-tractarians; while, on his own showing, he is on terms of close intimacy

with the most learned, the most amiable, and decidedly the most considerable of the party he disclaims—so much so, as to address him "*My dear Pusey.*" He is so far behind the scenes as to know *who were the authors of the anonymous* Tracts. And *how* did he know this? Others did not. For his knowledge must, on his own showing, have been an official knowledge. Mr. Sewell does not mean to say that he would *studiously* avoid habits of intimacy with estimable and learned men, solely on the ground of a suspicion which an inoffensive question might have dissipated. Moreover, did not Mr. Sewell, in more than one *Quarterly Review*, and in more than one newspaper, support, and that most decidedly, both the statements and the *tendency* of the Tracts? He cannot deny this: and, looking on these facts, we have but little opinion of the moral courage of the moral philosopher—much less the *Professor* of moral philosophy—who could, when the tide turned, turn with it, as Mr. Sewell has done!

That the "Tracts for the Times" have done extensive good, we do not deny—that they have also done extensive evil, we have little doubt: and while we willingly and gladly admit that the benefit to the Church has preponderated over the injury, we refer the benefit to the impetus given to the study of ecclesiastical antiquity—and we refer the evil to the unhallowed discussions which the Tracts have provoked.

Had it not been for these publications, we should have been spared some of the sophistries of Isaac Taylor—we should have escaped that deluge of ignorant declamation with which the semi-dissenters have inundated us: we should not have had the pain of seeing a divided Church, and a sneer of triumph on the lips of Popery and Dissent.

Let us hear both sides at once, in the person of Mr. Sewell:

"The circumstances of the times may fairly be considered as a sufficient reason for their original publication. But it is dangerous for any body of individuals, however small, to combine to disseminate peculiar religious opinions within the Church. It becomes still more dangerous, when their works have acquired, however improperly, a name, which compromises a great public University in no way responsible for them, and when they are put forth anonymously, and apparently with the sanction of the whole body; but as, it appears from Mr. Percival's letter, is the case with the Tracts, without any adequate superintendence being exercised over the opinions and expressions of the individual writers. When the object of this arrangement is, as Mr. Percival's statement also indicates, to 'produce effect,' 'to be effective,' 'to please,' and 'to strike,' this bias, however unintentionally, may still farther interfere with the simple enunciation of truth."

With this we entirely agree: it is intelligible and correct; nor

can we award less praise to the advice which Mr. Sewell gives Dr. Pusey, towards the close of the same letter:—

"I will venture to entreat you to consider, whether, under present circumstances, the continuation of the Tracts is not pregnant with danger to the cause of peace, and, what is dearer than peace, of truth?"

We would say that it is. But *can* the series be closed with No. 90, without some further steps being taken? Mr. Newman has already attempted to justify the Tract in question, and avowed his belief not only in its correctness, but in its necessity.

The Hebdomadal Board has recorded its decision; but will that be sufficient to exonerate the University? We think not. It will be necessary, if the matter is to be adjudicated by the University at all, to bring it before the notice of Convocation: and the sooner such a step be taken the better, both for the University and the Church.

Mr. Newman's influence is untouched, and he will, doubtless, go on to propagate his opinions. Let Mr. Sewell condemn them:

"And, lastly, though it is impossible to estimate too highly the value of the real catholic testimony of antiquity to the essential doctrines of Christianity, or to look without the highest veneration on the great fathers of the early Church, is it not dangerous to consider ourselves, or to lead others to consider themselves, as 'disciples of the Catholic Church,' rather than as the dutiful and affectionate children of that branch of it to which we immediately belong? May it not encourage a fanciful and even self-willed spirit, to throw them back upon a distant period of the Church, not for great truths which we are taught by our own Church, and are commanded by her to confirm by such testimony, but for habits of thought and practice, difficult to be realized, impossible to be understood in all their bearings, unfitted, it may be, for our own state, and powerless for effecting the good which is hoped from them—the proof of which need only be sought in the state of society at the time, and in the evils which subsequently sprung from them? From what has come under my own observation, I do think it more than ever necessary to maintain, that our access to the ancient Church must be through the channel of our own English Church, and under the control of living rulers, as well as of written rules."

We shall here close these remarks. We are strongly inclined to hope that the discussion about the 90th Tract will be productive of good. If it only identify the authors of the Tracts separately, it will not have been raised in vain. If it induce the Convocation of Oxford to pass a definitive sentence upon the series, it will be much *more* beneficial. If it should lead to a cessation of the Tracts altogether, and the re-allegiance of their worthy but much mistaken writers to the Church Catholic, as established in this realm, then shall we have cause to rejoice that ever there appeared that tissue of sophistry and heresy, No. 90 of "THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES."

Ecclesiastical Report.

THE PRINTING OF THE BIBLE.

Our readers are aware, and probably have expected some notice from us on the subject, that a party, composed, as we believe, altogether of English and Scotch Dissenters, are now clamouring for the removal of those restrictions, which a regard for the purity of the sacred text has long imposed on the printing of *Bibles* and *Testaments*. The Dissenters have always some favourite *war-cry*. Sometimes it is *Church-rates*; then *Liberty of Conscience*, as if any one wished to deprive them of their freedom: at one time *The iniquity of the connexion of Church and State;* at another, *The Universities*, and the exclusive system pursued in those ancient seats of learning. Like Mr. O'Connell, their trade is *Agitation!* Like him, too, they do not confine themselves to one topic. They are equal in versatility to that learned gentleman, and as rich in expedients. Of late they have broken new ground, and they have discovered that there ought to be a *free trade* in printing Bibles as well as in *corn*. Bibles, say they, can be printed and sold at a cheaper rate. The Bible-monopoly is a phrase constantly in their mouths. Large fortunes, say they, have been made by printing the sacred volume, and the cry is, what a shame that men should make the Bible an object of gain! These reforming gentlemen are so pure in their motives, so disinterested in all their actions, that they would not for the world pocket a single sixpence from the printing and circulating of the word of God. Oh, no; such a thing has never entered the thoughts of these *virtuous* gentlemen—the Bible-printing reformers: they would scorn the very idea of gain from such an employment. Who, however, does not see that the desire of gain lies at the bottom of the whole business? Some of the party may be disinterested in the part they are taking; but it will be difficult to show that the movers and ringleaders of the crusade are not of the *mammon-loving* and the *mammon-getting* generation.

The truth is, that the whole affair is a farce, got up by a few interested parties, who have, by working upon their feelings, enlisted a body of weak-minded religionists into their service: and thus the plea of religion and the glory of God is set up, while the leaders are merely seeking their own interest. It is, indeed, pretended that Bibles would be much cheaper if the permission to print them were general. Taking the paper and the execution into account, it is very doubtful whether a work of the same quality would be rendered to the public a fraction

cheaper than at present. Our own opinion is, that if the price were less, the books would be inferior in paper and execution. No one can complain that the Universities and the royal printers do not use their utmost exertions to render the Bibles as cheap as is consistent with a regard to a proper execution. Like many other *Dissenting* grievances, the Bible-monopoly, as it is termed, is only so in name, and not in reality: for no poor man, who wants a copy of the sacred volume, can be at any great loss to obtain one.

But our objections to any change in this important matter are derived from other and totally different considerations. They relate to the purity and integrity of the sacred text. We are quite sure that if Bibles could be printed without any restrictions, the erroneous glosses of men would be published to the world as the word of the eternal God. Translations would be multiplied—the numerous religious sects would all have their own versions of the inspired volume; and thus books totally at variance with each other would be put forth as the word of God. The scene would soon become so changed, that the poor man would be bewildered among the many different books, all putting forth the same claims to inspiration. And what check could be imposed to preserve the purity of the text, if the present salutary restrictions were removed?

Let it also be borne in mind, that were such a plan to be carried out, the infidel and the Romanist would be supplied with the strongest arguments in support of their respective systems: the former would point to the various and contradictory versions of the Bible, as an irrefragable proof that even professing Christians themselves were divided in opinion respecting the book from which they pretended to prove the divinity of their system; while the latter would triumphantly appeal to the same facts as so many evidences against the Protestant doctrine respecting the general distribution of the sacred Scriptures. Thus the one would derive an argument from the confusions that must prevail against a divine revelation altogether; the other would appeal to the same facts as so many proofs in favour of the pretended authority of the Church of Rome. We are of opinion that no man, who values the Bible and is anxious to preserve the sacred text uncorrupted, would be desirous of any change in this important matter.

In America there are no restrictions; any person may print the Bible in that *land of liberty!* And what are the consequences? We believe that it is a well attested fact, that all those ministers and congregations, who are anxious for the preservation of the purity of the sacred text, actually procure the

Bibles which are used in reading-desks and pulpits from England. Yes! They are fearful of using the Bibles printed in their own country, lest, instead of the word of God, they should read to the people the word of man. This fact speaks volumes on the subject. If, then, the Bible is to be preserved in its integrity, no rashly innovating hand must be permitted to remove those safeguards which we now possess, and which secure to every man in Great Britain a copy of the pure word of God. We say the pure word of God, for no man can allege that there are any material errors in the authorized translation. It has stood the test of time; nor have the various sects that have sprung up, with the exception of the Socinians, raised any objections against its use. As the law now stands, the authorized translation is faithfully given to the public. The Universities, with the royal printers, are responsible for the accuracy of the sacred text. But where would be the responsibility if the restrictions were removed? And what security should we have against the circulation of corrupted books, under the sacred name of the Word of God? It would be impossible, in these days of spurious liberality, for the Legislature to interfere, or to impose other restrictions, with a view to the preservation of the text in its integrity. All such interference would be denounced as an infringement upon Christian liberty; and loud clamour would be raised against any legislative enactments on such a subject.

DISSENTING AND LAY-BAPTISM.

Much has recently been said on this subject. Our readers are aware that the question has been argued in the Court of Arches at considerable length. A clergyman, it appears, had refused to bury a child that had been baptized only by a Dissenting minister, and his refusal was grounded on the allegation that the child had not received any baptism. The learned gentlemen who supported the case of the parties that instituted the suit against the clergyman, were fully aware that baptism by a Methodist preacher or a Dissenting minister could only be regarded as lay-baptism. Being fully aware that the ministry of Dissenters was not recognized by the Anglican Church, they were compelled to rest their cause on the assertion that *lay-baptism* is valid, and that it is so regarded by the Church herself.

It is not our intention to enter into all the arguments which were brought forward in the Court of Arches: still less are we disposed to defend the conduct of the clergyman, in refusing to bury the child. But though we abstain from touching upon the

merits of this particular case, we need not avoid the abstract question, which the recent proceedings in the Court of Arches have revived.

It is sometimes argued that the Church of England allows the validity of lay-baptism, because the Church of Rome permits midwives to administer that sacrament in cases of necessity. To such an argument, if argument it can be called, it is sufficient to reply, that the fact of the adoption of any particular practice by the Church of Rome, does not prove that it is received in the Anglican Church, or that it has been derived from the primitive ages: since every one knows full well that Rome has widely deviated from apostolic practice, as well as from apostolic doctrine. The argument, therefore, derived from the practice of the Romish Church is of no value whatever in such a question as that now under discussion.

There are two questions connected with this subject, which merit consideration in the controversy. The *first* relates to the views of the Anglican Church respecting *lay-baptism*. The *second* is consequent upon the former, and is simply this: supposing that the Church does, in certain cases, admit the validity of such baptisms, does she necessarily allow of the baptism which is administered by Dissenters? We shall take up the two questions in order.

First, with regard to the question of baptism by laymen: it appears certain that, in the early Church, laymen were not, in ordinary cases, permitted to baptize; but, in certain cases of necessity, baptisms conferred by laymen were considered valid.* Both these positions are undeniable; but we shall presently see that they do not in any way affect the question of baptism by Dissenters.

The *rubrics* in the *first* and *second* liturgies of King Edward, and also in the *books* of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, appear to leave the matter in some doubt: "First let them present call upon God for his grace, and say the Lord's prayer, if the time will suffer, and then one of them shall name the child, and dip him in the water, or pour water upon him." It is not specified whether the baptism is to be performed by a minister, or whether it may be administered by a layman. Certain it is, however, that in consequence of this rubric, laymen, and even women, did, in cases of great necessity, administer the sacrament of baptism.† Whitgift and others

* For testimonies on this point, see Bingham's Works, vol. viii., edition 1840. Straker.

† That such baptisms were only allowed in cases of necessity is clear, from the fact that midwives were permitted to administer the rite when the child at

contended, that private baptism was not allowed to be performed by laymen, but that it was so called because it was administered in private houses. That baptism was, therefore, administered in cases of necessity by laymen prior to the Hampton Court conference we are ready to allow; but we cannot admit that the practice was sanctioned by the *rubric* in question. Our reasons for such an opinion may be stated in a very few words. It appears to us that the rubric ought to be interpreted by the *article* on the same subject, than which nothing can be more explicit. In the twenty-third Article we have the following words—"It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the *sacraments* in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same." By this clause a layman was certainly restrained from administering the sacrament of baptism in public; and the only question is, whether in the office of private baptism the omission of the words *priest* or *curate* must be construed to signify that the rite might be performed by any one who was present. At the Hampton Court conference the affirmative and negative side on this matter were taken by the bishops who were present. The negative side was adopted by Whitgift, who alluded to the censures of the practice of lay-baptism by the bishops in their articles of enquiry at their visitations. The affirmative part was taken by the Bishops of London and Winchester, who argued that laymen were permitted to baptize in cases of necessity.

Whatever, therefore, may have been the case with respect to this question prior to that conference, it cannot be argued that, since that period, the Church of England has admitted the validity of *lay-baptism*. Even before that time the matter is doubtful, for in the year 1575, the convocation framed an article, in which the sense of the Church was declared to be against the practice.* Ever since the year 1603, however, the matter has been set at rest by the alterations in the rubric; and how it can be still argued, that the Church even now admits the validity of the practice, we are at a loss to conceive. Even in cases of necessity, none but a lawful minister is now permitted to administer this sacrament. Whether the *common law* requires a clergyman to read the burial service over a child baptized by

its birth was in danger. The permission to midwives is in our opinion a demonstration that the reformers never intended to resort to such a practice, except in cases of extreme necessity.

* Though it is sometimes said that this article was only sanctioned by the archbishops and bishops, yet it appears from good authority that it was approved by both houses of convocation. If so, we must allow that the Church has, since 1575, declared against *lay-baptism*. (See Collier's Ecc. Hist., ii. 552).

any other than a lawful minister, is a question into which we shall not enter; but with respect to the *Church*, we have no hesitation in declaring, that she does not authorize her ministers to read the service over any individual who was not baptized by a lawfully ordained minister.

Some light may be cast on the views of the reformers on this subject, by a reference to the customs of other reformed churches. It seems that most, if not all those churches, disallowed of *lay-baptism* altogether. Thus the French reformed church decided that "*baptism by an unordained person is wholly null and void.*" Cartwright, the Presbyterian, who may be considered as speaking the sentiments of his brethren in the time of Queen Elizabeth, condemns it: alluding to baptism by women, he says, "I take the baptism of women to be no more the holy sacrament of baptism than any other daily or ordinary washing of the child." Further, in the "Directory," set forth by the Westminster Assembly, it is stated that "*Baptism is not to be administered in any case by any private person, but by a minister of Christ.*" And in the "Confession" it is stated, that neither of the sacraments "*may be dispensed by any but by a minister of the word lawfully ordained.*"

Thus it is clear, that even the Presbyterians deny the validity of *lay-baptism;* and it must be apparent, that baptism administered by Dissenting ministers would be rejected by all those reformed churches in which the Presbyterian polity is retained, since they do not allow any person to administer that rite except an ordained minister; and it is well known that they do not consider what is termed *ordination* among the Independents and other bodies, whose discipline is similar, to be true ordination.*

It appears, therefore, that the rubric in the old services was not always interpreted so as to admit lay-baptism, even in private. Many of the divines of Queen Elizabeth's days contended that a lawful minister was necessary. Still there can be no question that at the commencement of the Reformation the practice was allowed. When, however, the rite had been administered, it was agreed on all hands that it was not to be repeated. In this sense its validity was admitted by Hooker and others.† The practice was discountenanced, but if under particular circumstances it had been resorted to, the act was considered valid. It appears that the Church allowed it in such cases,

* The Puritans were more anxious than the bishops for the rubric to be so altered as to exclude lay-baptism altogether.

† Hooker Keble's, lxii., vol. ii., p. 388.

in order to avoid certain inconveniences which might possibly arise.*

Still it is contended by some writers of considerable eminence, that as the Church has made no formal declaration against *lay-baptism*, she prefers that to no baptism at all. Thus a learned author remarks: "Though she discourages and prevents *lay-baptisms* as much as possible, yet she nowhere pronounces them null and void. She inhibits all persons not ordained from intermeddling with this office of God's ministers upon any pretence whatsoever; but if they have actually presumed to administer the ordinance *in its essentials*, that is, according to her, *the matter and the words*, she declines to order its repetition, and forbears to declare it null; for this would be an arbitrary conclusion against the sense of antiquity, and the constant declaration of the Catholic Church in such cases."† We are not satisfied with this argument, for it appears to us that the Church has virtually declared against the validity of *lay-baptism*, by the alteration of the rubric, under the plea of which the practice had been occasionally permitted. To us it appears that no other declaration was required on the part of the Church. The learned author just quoted proceeds: "Whether any necessity will justify a *layman* in usurping this office, is one question: but whether any guilt in the administrator so offending shall invalidate the ordinance so administered, is another question."‡ This gentleman contends that the question of *lay-baptism* is one of those cases which should be referred to the bishop of the diocese for his determination; and he supposes that the *revisers* of the office in 1603, by leaving the matter undecided, intended that it should be decided, as cases occurred, by the archbishops and bishops, agreeably to the clause in *the preface concerning the service of the Church*, which appoints *that all points of doubt arising from the want or from the obscurity of the rubrics, must be referred to the bishop; and if he determine them not, to the archbishop.*

We cannot, though we have the greatest reverence for the opinion of so eminent a *ritualist*, concur in the position, that the question of *lay-baptism* is one of those intended to be referred to the bishop; or that the matter is in any way doubt-

* Wheatly says, that the reformers intended to allow of *lay-baptism* by the rubric in King Edward's books, and that they acted on the principle of the Church of Rome, that baptism was essential to salvation. He adds, that soon after they explained the rubric so as to exclude it. This he conceives was the case, at all events, subsequent to the year 1575, when the archbishops and bishops resolved that private baptism should only be administered by a lawful minister.

† Sharp on the Rubric and Canons, p. 41.

‡ Ibid.

ful, since the alteration in the *rubric*. Undoubtedly the archbishops and bishops, as late as the year 1712, unanimously declared "*that lay-baptism should be discouraged as much as possible: but if the essentials had been preserved in a baptism by a lay-hand it was not to be repeated.*" It was resolved, after much discussion on the occasion to which we allude, that the question should be left undecided by any public declaration, as it had been left in the offices and canons of the Church. We cannot, however, conceive that the unwillingness of the archbishops and bishops, in 1712, to make a declaration on the subject, can be regarded as a settlement of the question. That they acted wisely in abstaining from such a declaration we must readily admit; but we cannot, from anything which took place on that occasion, infer that the Church herself has left the matter in doubt. Our decided opinion is, that the rubric before the alteration *was* doubtful, but that the article was conclusive against the practice: we further contend that all doubts were removed by the change subsequent to the conference at Hampton Court; and that the Church, though she has not put forth a public declaration on the subject, has in reality pronounced against the validity of *lay-baptism* altogether.

This position is also strengthened by the words of the catechism, which state that the sacraments are only *generally necessary to salvation*. When the sacraments cannot be obtained, God can make up for the use of them. On this principle *lay-baptism* is never necessary; and such seems to have been the opinion of the Church of England at and prior to the Hampton Court conference. This point is, in our opinion, fully established by the fact, that when the rubric was altered, so as to remove the ambiguity, the clause in the catechism was framed; which seems to be a declaration against *lay-baptism*, by asserting that baptism is not absolutely necessary to salvation, but only generally necessary as a duty whenever it can be lawfully administered.

But the question respecting the views of the Anglican Church on the subject of *lay-baptism* is totally different from that of baptism by Dissenters. It is admitted on all sides that the Church, if she sanctioned the practice at all, permitted it only in cases of extreme necessity. For instance, at the birth of a child, if a lawful minister could not be procured, the rite was administered by any individual who was present; and such baptism was recognised for a considerable period. It was only, therefore, in cases of necessity that it was permitted. This point is undeniable. But how can this permission on the part of the Church be pleaded in favour of baptism by Dissenting

ministers? The two things are as distinct as it is possible for two things to be. For, in the first place, the plea of necessity cannot be set up by Dissenters, or for them. In the cases allowed by the Church the rite was administered in a private chamber when the infant was in extreme danger, and when no *lawful* minister could be procured: but Dissenting baptism is publicly administered to children in perfect health, and in parishes where lawful ministers are appointed, who are ready at all times to administer the sacrament. The plea of necessity is not, indeed, urged by Dissenters; for they contend that their baptisms are equally valid with our own. Nor ought such a plea to be urged, as it sometimes is, by Churchmen. And secondly, *baptism*, though administered by a *layman*, was administered by a member of the Anglican Church: so that on this ground it may fairly be argued, that the two things are totally distinct. * The Church never contemplated such a thing as baptism by Dissenters. It must be remembered that the offices were framed at a period when separation from a true Church was by all parties viewed as a sin of no ordinary magnitude. By what process of reasoning, then, can it be pretended that the Anglican Church views Dissenting *baptisms* as valid and true? Assuredly they cannot be so viewed by the Church, unless it can be proved that she recognises their ministers as *lawfully* ordained ministers—a point, we presume, for which few persons will contend. As the *lay-baptism* contemplated by the Church after the Reformation it certainly cannot be regarded, for it is neither administered in cases of necessity, nor by lay-members of the Church; but by persons, who, though tolerated by the laws, are still acting in defiance of the canons of the Church. In early times, *lay-baptism*, in cases of necessity, was undoubtedly allowed; but not *schismatical baptism*, where no necessity could be pleaded.

Whether the clergy are under any constraint to read the *burial service* over those who have been baptized by Dissenters, is a question which we are not called upon to decide. We may, however, remark that if any such obligation lies upon the clergy, it is imposed upon them, not by the *rubrics* and *canons* of the Church, but by the *common law*.

Why, then, should Dissenters be anxious for a service to which they object—a service of a church from which they dissent? Why, if they refuse to accept the baptism of the Church, should they desire the burial of the Church? Is there not great incon-

* The midwives, who, in some cases, were allowed to administer the rite, were members of the Church, and actually sworn to the office.

sistency in this? On bringing a body to the churchyard they should, in order to preserve their consistency, tell the officiating minister that they did not desire the service, and that he might omit it, or use it, at pleasure.

They cannot plead conscience, for they pretend conscientious scruples against all our services, and to the burial service in particular. Is it not passing strange that they should be unwilling to be considered as members of the Church during their lives, and yet that they should be anxious to be pronounced such after death?—for they cannot deny that any individual who is buried according to the service of the Church of England is buried as a member of the Church. There can, then, be but one reason assigned for such proceedings on the part of Dissenters, namely, a desire to oppress the clergy, and to raise a clamour against the Church.

Many Dissenters, perhaps, are not aware that baptisms by *their* ministers are not recognised by the *Presbyterian* Church of Scotland. Such, however, is the case. In the "Directory" at present in use in Scotland it is ordained that, as "Baptism, is not unnecessarily to be delayed, so it is not to be administered in any case by any private person, but by a minister of Christ, called to be the steward of the mysteries of God." And by the "Confession," still in use, it is stated, "There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the Gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord: neither of which may be dispensed by any but a minister of the word, lawfully ordained." Now it is well known that the Scottish Church does not admit the ministrations of Dissenting ministers. She takes as high a ground as the Anglican Church. The former, however, has not appointed any service to be used at the burial of the dead; and, therefore, we hear nothing of the hardship of refusing Christian burial to Dissenters. If they raise a clamour against an English clergyman for refusing to read a service which was certainly intended to be used only at the interment of those who had died members of the Church of England—they ought, if the thing were a matter of conscience, to complain of the Scottish clergy for using no service at all.

THE POPE AND THE GOVERNMENT SYSTEM OF EDUCATION.

It must be most flattering to her Majesty's ministers to find that the Pope, or the Bishop of Rome, is not opposed to, or, at all events, that he has not condemned, by issuing an anathematizing bull, that plan of education, which they, in their great wisdom, have devised as a *panacea* for all the evils by which

the sister country has for so many ages been afflicted. This circumstance is, indeed, almost sufficient to make them regard their education scheme as the wisest measure of their administration—as the *quintescence* of human policy. For a professedly Protestant government to concoct a plan which the *head* of the Romish Church has thought fit, if not to approve in every particular, at least not to condemn, must be regarded as the very *acme* of legislation. Truly the Pope's approval is a feather in their cap. None of the laurels which they have already reaped can be compared to this. The scheme must render them famous in history as long as time shall pursue its course. Such a result was never achieved by a Protestant government until now. Whether his Holiness has written a private letter to her Majesty's ministers on the subject, or not, is a question which we cannot determine: but if he has one spark of gratitude in his nature he will not fail to make some suitable return.

The Pope's letter is dated January 16, 1841, from the city of Rome, and is addressed to the Papal archbishops and bishops in Ireland. After some general remarks, the pontiff proceeds in the following strain: "Having, therefore, accurately weighed all the dangers and all the advantages of the system—having heard the reasoning of the contending parties—and having, above all, received the gratifying intelligence that for ten years since the introduction of this system of education the Catholic religion does not appear to have sustained any injury—the *sacred congregation* has, with the approval of our most holy father, Pope Gregory XVI., resolved that no judgment should be definitely pronounced in this matter; and that this kind of education should be left to the prudent discretion and religious conscience of each individual bishop; whereas its success must depend on the vigilant care of the pastors, on the various cautions to be adopted, and on the future experience which time will supply." The *sacred congregation*, however, with *his Holiness*, deemed it necessary to issue a few admonitions; of which, one has a special reference to the books used in the schools. It is as follows: "That all books which contain any noxious matter, either against the *canon* or *purity* of the sacred Scripture, or against the doctrine of the Catholic Church, ought to be removed from the schools: and this can be the more easily effected, because there is no law of the said system opposed to it." Dr. McHale and Dr. Murray, both dutiful sons of the *holy see*, have been contending with each other about this system of education; the one approving what the other condemns: they have furnished a most edifying spectacle

of that *union* which subsists between the head and the members of the Romish Church; as also of the union of the various members among themselves. Nor is the attempt of the Pope to adjust the differences amongst his vassals likely to strengthen the convictions of the public in favour of the boasted *unity* of the Papal Church. The position occupied by the pontiff is a very humble one: he does not at once decide the matter; he hears arguments on both sides, not much like an infallible judge, and his conclusion, or his judgment, appears to us to partake pretty largely of the spirit of this world's policy and politics. So far from settling the dispute between the two ecclesiastics, the Pope has arrived at a decision which will open the door to perpetual warfare—and this, too, within the *sacred pale!* Certainly, former pontiffs managed such matters more discreetly. No judgment is to be pronounced: but each bishop is to be left to his own discretion.

What, however, becomes of the *Papal infallibility?* Why should the Pope refuse to decide on a subject of such vast importance? The doctrine of *expediency* should not find a place in the creed of an *infallible church.*

Having, however, the unseemly spectacle before his eyes of two bishops of a church, whose boast is *unity* with the *head,* and *unity* among the members, contending with each other through the public press, the Pope at the close of his letter has expressed his desire that "the bishops and other ecclesiastics shall refrain from contending in this controversy in the newspapers, or other such publications; lest the honour of religion, their own characters, or Christian charity, should be injured to the disedification of the Church." No more controversy, therefore, between Popish bishops; no further letters from *John Tuam* to *Lord John Russell.* All such strife must now be hushed, or where will be the obedience to the sovereign pontiff?

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

Under this head we purpose to glance briefly at that movement which is everywhere going forward in favour of our national Church. That our Church is rooted in the affections of the great majority of the people is an undisputed fact. The very efforts of the Dissenting body to put down the Church have recoiled upon their own heads, by revealing their weakness. We allude to the registration scheme, which has proved that they are a mere fraction of the community. On this occasion, however, we intend only to notice the proceedings of our own

members. In all our large towns, and in most of our populous districts, societies, *clerical* and *lay*, are formed, whose aim is the advancement of the interests of the Church. *Tract Associations* and *Lay Associations* exist in every quarter. As our enemies, comprehending a most heterogeneous mass of materials—Papists, Infidels, Radicals, and Dissenters—have entered into a combination to destroy the Church, it is necessary that our friends and supporters should unite themselves into a firm compact, not only to resist the attacks of opponents, but also to adopt any measures which circumstances may render desirable. One of the effects resulting from Dissenting and Papal opposition is apparent, namely, that the Church herself is aroused; and when once she puts forth her strength she will be more than a match for the united forces of her enemies. One of her Majesty's ministers once remarked *that the Church of England was a huge unwieldy body, and that it required a great deal to move her; but that when once she began to move, it would be exceedingly difficult to restrain her.* The time is come for the Church to move: she is alive to her best interests; and her Majesty's ministers have, on many occasions of late, experienced the truth of the assertion which proceeded from one of their colleagues.

The associations of which we speak, and which are becoming very numerous, are formed for the special purpose of defending the rights of the Anglican Church. When bad men are banded together for evil, good men must unite for good. The means adopted by these societies are the circulation of books and tracts, the diffusion of information on all subjects connected with ecclesiastical affairs, petitioning the Imperial Parliament, and the adoption of such courses as the circumstances of the country may render necessary. Such efforts will not be made in vain; nor have we the least doubt that they will completely counteract the evils resulting from the *Catholic Institute* and the *Ecclesiastical Knowledge Society.* Thousands and tens of thousands of tracts, on all subjects connected with the Church, are circulated throughout the length and breadth of the land. We view these efforts, therefore, with unmingled satisfaction; we regard them as an omen of much good in time to come; and we trust that the inhabitants of every town and every village in the kingdom will become so well informed on all subjects connected with the welfare of the Church and our holy religion, that the emissaries of Infidelity, Socialism, Popery, Radicalism, and Dissent, will feel that the people of this country, whatever may be the case with a portion of our population, are firmly attached to the Church of their fathers.

SCHISMATICAL CONSECRATIONS.

Within the last year a Popish bishop was consecrated to his office in the city of Bath. The circumstance deserves to be noticed on several accounts. We are not sure that it is not the only case in this country since the Reformation, with the exception of those individuals who, during the reign of the second James, were consecrated, by his Majesty's command, in the chapel royal at St. James's. We designate such an act a schismatical consecration; for it is clear, from the canons always in such matters acted upon in the Church, that either the bishops of the Church of England, or those of the Church of Rome, are in a state of schism. By the canons in question, canons always recognised in the Church, there cannot be two bishops in one see, nor two opposite lines of the succession in one province. It is true that Rome affects to deny the validity of our orders; but she has not until lately ventured to consecrate bishops in our English sees. Her practice has been to consecrate them to their office on the continent, and then send them to England in the character of vicars apostolic to the Pope. By the canons of the Church, we mean of the Universal Church, no foreign bishop can exercise jurisdiction in sees which are filled by canonical bishops. If, therefore, our English bishops can establish their claim to that character, all the acts of the Papal bishops, in consecrating others in this country, are null and void. The consecrators may be true bishops, their consecrations having been performed in a place where the Church of Rome is dominant; but still they cannot proceed to perform episcopal acts in our English dioceses, unless, indeed, our English prelates are, as the Church of Rome pretends, heretics and schismatics.

The act, therefore, of consecrating a bishop at Bath proclaims the views of the Church of Rome at the present moment; and as it could not have taken place but with the concurrence of the Pope, we cannot but remind the Romanists of this country, that the sovereign pontiff is not a little inconsistent, in this matter, with his own proceedings relative to the government scheme of education, to which we have already alluded. Both the Papists of England and the Pope himself have now proclaimed to the English people, that in their estimation the Protestant Bishop of Bath and Wells is a usurper; for certain Papal bishops have actually proceeded to an act of consecration in that diocese. We, however, can prove that Rome is guilty of the heresy and the schism, and not the Anglican Church. Our bishops are true bishops according to the ancient canons; our Church is modelled after the primitive practice, and our prelates are *in* canonical, as well as in lawful, possession of the sees into

which this country is divided: it is, therefore, clear, that whatever may the case with those countries in which Rome is supreme, a question into which we shall not enter, the orders conferred by Popish ecclesiastics in this country are absolutely void; inasmuch as they are conferred in dioceses that are full, and in contravention of the canons of the Universal Church.

We are anxious to direct attention to this proceeding of the Romanists; for having commenced a new course, with respect to this matter, it is not probable that they will cease. Not only may we expect that Papal consecrations will take place in England, but we may also be sure that the Romanist body will not rest satisfied until they have placed one of their bishops in each of our sees, as is the case in Ireland. Until the year 1733, a *vicar apostolic* did not reside in England. What strides has Popery made since that period! Let the people, however, do their duty, and no uncomfortable apprehensions respecting the result need be entertained.

CLERICAL IRREGULARITIES.

We believe that some clergyman of our Anglican Church preaches every year in London, in the month of May, for the London Missionary Society—a society of Dissenters, formed for the express purpose of sending out Dissenting missionaries. A few years since, we well remember that the sermon was preached in the chapel of the Honourable and Reverend Baptist Noel, by the Rev. Dr. Dillon, both of them clergymen of the Church of England, yet both in the habit of acting very much in concert with Dissenters. It is, indeed, a remarkable fact, that the clergymen who give their churches for this object, and those who preach the sermons, are men, in every instance, who pay little regard to the canons, rubrics, and discipline of the Church, to whose formularies they have solemnly subscribed, or to their diocesans, to whom they have sworn to pay canonical obedience. Last year, the sermon was preached in Mr. Noel's chapel by a clergyman from Birmingham; and this year, the name of *the Rev. William Carter*, B.A., Incumbent of Malton, Yorkshire, is announced. Of the Rev. William Carter we know nothing. Judging, however, from the B.A. appended to his name, we should deem him to be a very young man. His inexperience, therefore, may perhaps be pleaded as an excuse for his violation of Church order.

Now on this subject we have to remark, that the clergy who give their churches, and those who preach the sermons, are evidently guilty of a violation of ecclesiastical discipline, to say nothing of the inconsistency of such a proceeding. The Church of England is tolerant to others, inasmuch as she would

not interfere with their worship; but she certainly requires that her clergy should submit to that discipline, which, however it may have fallen into disuse, is still the discipline by which all the proceedings of the clergy should be regulated. We would, then, put it to the consciences of those gentlemen who, in such a public way, support this Dissenting society, whether they believe that the Church or her reformers ever contemplated the possibility of the clergy using their churches or preaching sermons for societies necessarily opposed to her discipline and government?

SOCIALISM.

Though the most strenuous efforts are made by the advocates of Socialism, there is reason to believe that their influence, so far from increasing, is on the wane. The apostle of this horrible system, Mr. Owen, has actually been obliged to quit the city of Bristol, where he had been lecturing to his followers. It appears that Mr. Brindley, of whom honourable mention has been made by the Bishop of Exeter, followed Owen to Bristol, and exposed the evils of Socialism before crowded audiences in that city. At length Mr. Owen, finding that his followers were quitting his ranks, accepted the challenge for a public discussion. A scene of the most extraordinary kind was witnessed at these discussions; and, after a few evenings, Mr. Owen suddenly quitted Bristol, leaving his opponent in possession of the field. Though it is clear that the evil is not advancing as it once did, yet some steps should be taken by the Imperial Parliament to suppress it altogether; or, at all events, to prevent the open and public propagation of doctrines which, unless checked, must sap the very foundations of all our social institutions. Petitions should be forwarded to Parliament, and all legitimate means should be adopted to preserve the population of this country from such contamination. The Bishop of Exeter will be at his post in the House of Lords: nor are we without the hope, that, even in the present session, some measures may be devised to arrest the progress of principles at once so destructive and so blasphemous.

THE BAPTISM OF THE PRINCESS ROYAL.

Since our last report, the Princess Royal has been initiated into the Christian Church by baptism. Some persons have complained that the rubric was not strictly observed, because a larger number of sponsors was present on the occasion than is specified in the service. The objection, however, is most futile; for the Church has not restricted the number. She requires, indeed, that there should be three in every case,

but she does not declare that there shall not be more. We cannot, however, but regret, that the baptism was solemnized in a *private* dwelling; for, after all, the drawing-room at Buckingham Palace can only be regarded by the Church as a private house. The Church, except in cases of necessity, requires that baptism should be celebrated publicly in the Church: she further requires that this solemnity should be performed on Sundays or holy-days, unless there be some good reason for fixing any other time. "*Nevertheless, (if necessity so require) children may be baptized on any other day.*" Such is the language of the rubric, from which it is evident that the Church intended that baptism, except in cases of need, should be celebrated on Sundays, or on those festivals which she had appointed to be kept holy. The time, too, in the service, is prescribed by the Church, namely, after the second lesson at morning or evening prayer. Hence, as our most gracious Sovereign is supreme in this country in all matters ecclesiastical—as she is the temporal governor of that Church of which the Lord Jesus Christ is the head, we hold that it would have been a most gratifying, yea, and a most edifying spectacle, if the Princess Royal had been dedicated to the Lord in strict conformity with the *rubrics*. It would have been an excellent example to all parties, in these days of indifference and irregularity; and should a prince be born, we indulge the hope, that all the requirements of the Church will be most strictly complied with, that the baptism will be in the Chapel Royal, during the time of public service, and in strict accordance with the rubric. Should it be deemed dangerous to expose the royal infant to the external air at the period when it may be thought desirable to administer the sacrament of baptism, it would be far better to delay its celebration, than not to conform to the regulations of the Church.

EPISCOPACY IN THE COLONIES.

We have frequently alluded to the state of our Church in our colonial possessions; and on many previous occasions we have pointed out the necessity of erecting such a number of bishoprics as shall be sufficient for the immense population subject to our control. It is, as we are informed, intended to form episcopal sees in *New Zealand* and in *New Brunswick*. We rejoice at the intelligence, and we are sure that the great majority of her Majesty's subjects will rejoice also. Every man who wishes for the prosperity of the colonies must be anxious for the extension of our national Church in all our possessions. What can our Indian bishops do in watching over the vast numbers committed to their care? Or what can be done by the few bishops who have been established in our other

colonies? We trust that the British public will not rest satisfied until the machinery of the Church is sufficient to carry out the intentions of the Church in every colony of the British empire. It is stated that her Majesty the Queen Dowager intends to endow a bishopric in the island of Malta, where she has already devoted the sum of ten thousand pounds to the erection of a church. Would that others might follow her noble example! It is a gratifying thought, that an English bishop will be resident on that island to whose barbarous inhabitants St. Paul first preached the everlasting Gospel.

CHURCH EXTENSION.

We are anxious to remind our readers that a motion on this subject will be submitted to Parliament during the present session. Last year the motion of Sir Robert Inglis was lost in consequence of the absence of Conservative members. Our advice to all the friends of the Church is this—send up petitions to Parliament, and remind your members of your wishes—tell them that you cannot rest until something has been done by the Legislature in favour of Church extension. The people of England must not relax in their exertions this year, because the object was not gained last year. Many petitions were presented during the last session, and more must be sent up in the present, or the opponents of the measure will plead for its rejection on the ground of the indifference of the people; and as a proof of that indifference, they will point to the small number of petitions on the table, in comparison of those of the last session. Let the people, therefore, be determined not to sit still, nor to cease to send up petitions to Parliament, until the end be accomplished. How have all great measures been carried? After repeated attempts and repeated failures? If, then, we fail in one session, we must pursue the same course with respect to petitions in the next, and continue it, session after session, until our efforts are crowned with success.

CHURCH RATES.

John Thorogood has again refused to pay the sum of *thirteen shillings and sixpence* for Church-rates: but it seems that some person, if not John himself, has secretly paid the money, so that the martyr is saved from another *profitable* incarceration. The decision of the Court of Queen's Bench in the *Braintree case* has been confirmed by Chief Justice Tindal, simply, however, on the ground *that the rate had been improperly levied.* His lordship remarked, in giving his judgment, that "it had been observed, that to grant the prohibition, would be to take away all the

power of the Ecclesiastical Court to compel the payment of a rate by reluctant parishioners. But this was not so; for all the powers of the spiritual court to compel the reparation of the Church were left untouched by the present decision—that the court still possessed the power of compelling the churchwardens to make the rate, or cause it to be made, and of compelling the parishioners to pay it, when made according to law." Now we would only remark, that as long as the law on this subject remains in force, no members of our Anglican Church should be deterred from doing their duty by the dishonest attempts of Dissenters to refuse to hand over to the Church that which, on no principle of law or reason, can be considered as their own. Their property was acquired under the present law; consequently, to attempt to keep back what really does not belong to them, is a violation of the sacred principle of justice.

HER MAJESTY'S SPEECH AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION.

The speech of her Majesty is, as a matter of course, the speech of her ministers. It may, perhaps, be supposed that, in an ecclesiastical report, such a document, containing, as is generally the case, allusions only to political matters, ought not to be noticed. Royal speeches are remarkable, not for what they say, but rather for the adroitness with which all important matters are evaded. We, however, notice the speech in consequence of the last paragragh: "I place my reliance on your wisdom, loyalty, and patriotism; and I humbly implore of DIVINE PROVIDENCE that all your councils may be so directed as to advance the great interests of morality and religion, to preserve peace, and to promote, by enlightened legislation, the welfare and happiness of all classes of my subjects." Every true Englishman will concur in this prayer. Sincerely do we hope that it may be answered. Should the *present members of the* TWO HOUSES be permitted to continue their deliberations—a circumstance, perhaps, not very probable—many grave and weighty subjects will be brought under their notice before the termination of the session. Some of these questions will be connected with religion and morality; and we hope that the men who penned the speech will remember, in all debates on such matters, their own words, and that they will not introduce measures hostile to the interests of that Church of which they are the sworn defenders, and but for whose existence, religion in this country must languish and decay.

General Literature.

The Rights of the Poor and Christian Almsgiving Vindicated; or, The State and Character of the Poor, and the Conduct and Duties of the Rich, exhibited and illustrated. By S. R. Bosanquet, Esq. London: Burns. 1841.

THE condition and character of the poor have long required a more fair and Christian representation than the evidence elicited by the Poor Law, or the reports of Mendicity Societies. Mr. Bosanquet has taken upon him to be their champion, and has certainly performed his task with much zeal and much kindness. He has, too, the better feelings of mankind enlisted on his side; for to speak harshly of, and to act harshly towards, the poor, or the seeming poor—though it may be a virtue with Whig-Radical economists—has ever been esteemed something like a crime by Churchmen. Yet we feel that Mr. Bosanquet writes as an advocate, "Medio tutissimus." We shall soon take up the subject ourselves, and we have documents that will show how applicable is the old adage in the present instance.

Chaucer's Poems Modernized. With an Introduction by R. H. Horne, and a Life of Chaucer by Professor Leonhard Schmitz. London: Whittaker. 1841.

To say that we are greatly pleased with this modernization, would be merely saying what it deserves. The Life, by Professor Leonhard Schmitz, is a very pleasing piece of biography: few Englishmen write their own language with more accuracy and elegance than does this young, but accomplished, scholar of Germany. The poems selected are, for the most part, well done, especially those by Wordsworth and Powell. For our own parts, we naturally prefer the black letter; but we do not doubt that this elegant adaptation will make the father of English poetry more known than he is to the present generation; and it has, therefore, our hearty commendations.

Live while you Live. By the Rev. T. Griffiths, M.A., Minister of Rams Chapel, Homerton. London: Burns. 1841.

MR. GRIFFITHS appears to have been struck so forcibly with the excellence of Doddridge's well-known epigram, that he has taken up the subject thus suggested to him in a course of lectures, viewing human life in its various aspects; and has affectionately dedicated the little volume to the younger members of his flock. Like all that proceeds from Mr. Griffiths' pen, it is well worthy of attention.

An Attempt to ascertain the true Chronology of the Book of Genesis. By George Smith. London: Simpkin and Co. 1840.

THIS "Attempt" was originally a lecture, delivered by the author at the Literary Institution, Camborne, Cornwall. Its object is to establish the longer chronology of the book of Genesis, as exhibited in the Septuagint version; which chronology has been elaborately defined by Mr. Jackson, in his "Chronological Antiquities;" by Dr. Hales, in his "New Analysis of Chronology;" and by Bishop Russell, of the Scottish Episcopal Church at Glasgow, in his "Connexion of Sacred and Profane History." Those who have not leisure to investigate their elaborate remarks, will find the subject comprehensively and clearly discussed in this little work. Lest, however, any of our readers should be distressed by the apprehension that the establishment of the larger chronology may affect the credibility of the facts related in the book of Genesis, we may incidentally remark, that chronological differences are not confined to the holy Scriptures; they equally exist in profane historians: but these differences do not necessarily infer any uncertainty in the *matters of fact* which they have related. It is yet a disputed question in what year the city of Rome was built, and also whether it was originally founded by Romulus; yet no one doubts the fact that Rome *was* built, or that such a person as Romulus actually existed.

A Supplement to Dr. Sall's True Catholic and Apostolic Faith maintained in the Church of England, as recently republished with Notes; in which the groundlessness of the charges and insinuations contained in a notice of the Work in the "British Magazine" for December, 1840, and also in the following January number, is considered and exposed. By the Rev. J. Allport. London: Whittaker. 1841. 8vo.

THIS is a satisfactory vindication by Mr. Allport of his seasonable reprint of Dr. Sall's learned defence of our Church (which was noticed in page 503 of our number for October, 1840), against the strictures published in a contemporary journal. Mr. A. has added various useful notes and corrections, which the possessors of Dr. Sall's work will do well to procure, in order to complete their copies.

Scott's Bible. (New Edition). Part 1. London: Seeleys. 1841.

AN excellent and cheap reprint of a work, which, while we occasionally differ from it in opinions, we always use for its piety and practical utility.

Selections from the Proverbs and Book of Ecclesiastes, in English, French, Italian, and German. London: Murray. 1841. 16mo.

THIS is a very useful selection from the Books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, comprising a series of precepts of general application to persons of all ages, in the four languages above indicated. It is intended for the use of young persons studying those languages; who, "by learning daily one sentence in the English part, and reading, translating, and comparing with it the corresponding sentence in French, Italian, or German, may, in the course of the year, acquire many excellent maxims and rules of conduct, and at the same time familiarize themselves with the idiom of three other languages, with the sacrifice of very little time or trouble." The versions here given are, the Italian of Diodàti, the German of Luther, and the revision of the French Protestant translation by David Martin, with the authorized English version. This little volume is beautifully printed, and has our commendation, as being likely to answer the benevolent intention of the compiler.

Sephardim; or, The History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal. By James Finn. London: Rivingtons. 1841.

THAT branch of the Jewish nation which was early located in the peninsula, and was distinguished for learning, wealth, and ability, was called Sephardim; the other, or German branch of the European Jews, being denominated Ashkenazim. Of the former and more important race, Mr. Finn has, in the interesting volume before us, given a very admirable history. Of all the books about the Jews (and truly their name is legion) which the modern press pours out on the world, Sephardim is the most learned, the most accurate, the most romantic, and the most instructive.

The Sermons of the Right Reverend Robert Sanderson, D. D., late Lord Bishop of Lincoln. With a Life by Isaac Walton, and an Introductory Preface by the Rev. Robert Montgomery, M. A. of Lincoln College, Oxford, and Minister of St. Jude's Church, Glasgow. 2 vols. London: Ball and Arnold. 1841.

WE had marked several passages for extraction in Mr. Montgomery's admirable preface, but the pressure of other matter compels us, for the present, to content ourselves with recommending to our readers this excellent edition of a divine, of whom King Charles the Martyr is reported to have said—"I carry my ears to hear other preachers, but my conscience to hear Sanderson."

A Selection from the Unpublished Papers of the Right Reverend William Warburton, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Gloucester. By the Rev. Francis Kilvert, M. A., late of Worcester College, Oxford. London: Nichols. 1841.

PERHAPS of all the remarkable men of his day, William Warburton was the most powerful minded. His gigantic intellect, his easily excited spleen, and the prominent part which he took in the controversies of his age, have led us to look at him too much as a mere polemic—an intellectual gladiator. Mr. Kilvert has given us a selection, from his unpublished papers, calculated to set him in a more amiable, let us say, a juster point of view.

A History of the Reformation on the Continent. By the Very Rev. George Waddington, D.D., Dean of Durham. London: Duncan and Malcolm. 1841.

WE propose, in our next number, to devote an article to this important subject; and shall do this in a review of the Dean of Durham's very able and instructive history—that of Merle d'Aubigné and Count Valerian Krasinsky's History of the Reformation in Poland. Our only reason for mentioning this book (Dr. Waddington's) now, is to apprize our readers that it is out, and eminently worthy their attention.

John Huss. The Workings of Popery in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Translated from the German, by Margaret Anne Wyatt. London: Seeleys. 1841.

AT a time like the present, every contribution to the history of Popery is valuable, and we look, therefore, upon this excellent translation (which does Miss Wyatt great credit) as peculiarly seasonable. The history of John Huss is more than usually instructive, and it is well brought before us in the present volume.

Letters to an Aged Mother. By a Clergyman. London: Seeleys. 1841.

IN these letters, though there are some things, perhaps, of a too private and peculiar character, we meet with a warmth of devotional feeling, a soundness of judgment, and a correctness of doctrine, which affords us much pleasure. The print, too, is good and large.

Summer Rambles and Winter Amusements. By a Clergyman's Widow. London: Darton and Clark. 1841.

WERE it only that this little book is written by a clergyman's widow, we should feel inclined in its favour; but it is so well written, and in so good a spirit, that it may fairly rest its claims to public approbation on its own merits.

Life and Remains of the Rev. Robert Houseman, B.A. By Robert Fletcher Houseman, Esq. London: Simpkin and Marshall. 1841.

THE revival of religion in the last century numbered among its most zealous and sincere promoters, Mr. Houseman, of Lancaster. He was a burning and a shining light; and for forty years, during which he was the minister of St. Anne's church, his example, as well as his doctrine, was eminently calculated to do good. In the memoir before us, Wesley, Whitefield, Lady Huntingdon, and all the chief movers of the religious revival spoken of, find their place; original letters are given; and a valuable contribution is made to some future "Religious History of the Eighteenth Century."

My Life. By an Ex-Dissenter. London: Fraser. 1841.

AN able book, with an able preface. We are, however, sorry to meet with the offensive word "Puseyite" in its pages. It is used only once, but we feel persuaded that so sound a Churchman will expunge it in the next edition. Nicknames are unworthy of him; and we wish that those who invented the one in question had only a tithe of Dr. Pusey's Christian spirit.

Washington: an Essay. By M. Guizot. Translated from the French, by Paul Parnell, Esq. London: Painter. 1841.

IT would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to find a living writer more capable of appreciating the character, and, what is more, the position of Washington, than that enlightened minister, M. Guizot. To praise him would be a work of supererogation, and we shall, therefore, only say that Mr. Parnell has ably translated the essay.

Sermons. By George Goodenough Lynn, M.A., Minister of St. John's Chapel, Hampton Wick. London: Seeleys. 1841.

IT is giving no great praise to say of a volume of sermons, published in the present day, that they are good ones; and yet what more is there to be said? These before us are sound in doctrine, and elegant in language; and as they are profitable to read, so, we doubt not, they were profitable to hear.

The Theory and Practice of Valuing Tithes. By Taylor Cooke. London: Shaw and Sons. 1841.

THOSE of our readers who are interested in this question may find much useful information in Mr. Cooke's volume, which possesses the additional value, that it is not a book "de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis."

Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians. By John Calvin. Translated from the original by the Rev. William Pringle, Auchterarder. Edinburgh: Clark. 1841.

CALVIN is one of those divines who, though much talked of, are seldom read, save by the recluse student; yet those best acquainted with his works know that, however erroneous he may occasionally be in doctrine, his writings can never be studied without benefit. The Commentary on the Ephesians and Galatians abounds with practical matter of a very valuable character, and is most efficiently translated by Mr. Pringle.

Thoughts on Phrenology. By a Barrister. Nisbet.

THE author of this little book is a man of philosophical mind; he perceives that phrenology is not bound by the dicta of Mr. George Combe, and that, consequently, it is neither answerable for the latitudinarianism nor the love of expediency which distinguish that gentleman. To all those who are in doubt about the compatibility of phrenology with Christianity, we would recommend the thoughts of the Barrister.

Stories of the Animal World; arranged so as to form a Systematic Introduction to Zoology. By the Rev. B. H. Draper. London: Darton and Clark. 1841.

THIS little collection is a very pleasing one, and well fitted for its object. The juvenile world ought to be much obliged to Mr. Draper, for thus bringing within their reach the latest discoveries of naturalists.

Reasons for Conservatism. By the Rev. Matthew Hutchinson, B.A. London: Whittaker. 1841.

IF any body were to be convinced by argument, we should say to the Whig-Radical, read Mr. Hutchinson's book; but as we apprehend that this is not very likely to be the case, we must content ourselves with recommending it to the Conservative, who wishes to give a reason for his political creed.

Alda, the British Captive. By Miss Agnes Strickland. London: Rickerby. 1841.

ONE of the very best tales that we ever remember to have read; equally good in its intention and execution. Did our space permit, we should make long extracts: as it is, we can only recommend our readers to get the volume for themselves. A more pleasing present for a young person need not be desired.

The Englishman's Library. Vols. 14, 15, 16. London: Burns. 1841.

1. *Charles Lever: the Man of the Nineteenth Century.* By the Rev. William Gresley, M. A., Prebendary of Lichfield.
2. *Scripture History (New Testament).* By the Hon. and Very Rev. H. E. I. Howard, D.D., Dean of Lichfield.
3. *Tales of the Village.* Second Series. By the Rev. E. Paget.

We are very glad to be able to give our unmingled approbation to these little books, which, in every way, are likely to be useful. So good a series (there are but two exceptions—viz., Sewell's "Morals," and Churton's "English Church") cannot fail to have a very beneficial tendency in these days of latitudinarianism and ill-concealed scepticism. May they go on and prosper. The tale by Mr. Gresley is the best of his efforts in fiction, and Mr. Paget has admirably read to the Dissenter, in this second series of the "Tales of the Village," the lesson which, in the former series, he read to the Papist.

Abraham, the Father of the Faithful. London: Seeleys. 1841.

The present is a book-making age; that is, it is an age for making little books, and reprinting great ones. Now so long as the makers of little books can find a market for their wares, doubtless they do well to prosecute their business. At all events, we shall not complain of the taste of the day, if really good little books, such as the present, are called forth by it.

The Centurion: Portraits of Roman Officers delineated in the New Testament. London: Seeleys. 1841.

This, again, is an instance similar to "Abraham, the Father of the Faithful;" but it is a superior book, and, in the hands of a judicious preacher, might furnish matter for a course of interesting village lectures.

Anti-Popery; or, Popery Unreasonable, Unscriptural, and Novel. By John Rogers. London: Simpkin and Marshall. 1841.

This volume comes recommended by a host of newspapers, all of which say that Mr. Rogers is a literary giant. He may be; but if so, he is like most giants, a very clumsy and awkward person. There is nothing in the volume that has not been much better said before; and the language is such, that those who hear it may suppose, in the words of Butler, that—

> "They'd heard three labourers of Babel,
> Or Cerberus himself, pronounce
> A leash of languages at once."

1. *The Latter Days of the Jewish Church and Nation.* By Dominie McCausland, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. Dublin: Curry. 1841.
2. *A Brotherly Enquiry for "The Holy One of Israel."* London: Ridgway. 1841.

We are, in the present day, overwhelmed with works about the Jews, or rather *books* about them, either hastily concocted without due study, or else actually manufactured by scissars-and-paste artists. Hence the great want of originality which such books display. This is not, however, what we find fault with; but rather, that they were ever published at all. The two volumes before us are very well made up, but there was no need of them, and the labour and expense might have been very well spared.

Slavery, and the Internal Slave Trade in the United States of North America. London: Ward. 1841.

It so happens that we have made preparations for articles, of some extent, on most of the subjects on which the books submitted to us for review are written. No man can read this volume (Slavery, &c.)—that is, no man who has the common feelings of humanity, and has not lived in that *land of liberty*, America—without being struck with utter horror at the records of human depravity here unfolded. Surely America must be stricken with judicial blindness, having such a load of guilt upon her, to provoke a war with any nation, much less with Great Britain.

Dreams and Dreaming. By Mrs. Blair. London: Groombridge. 1841.

Mrs. Blair advocates the theory that, even in these days, dreams are frequently revelations from on high; and she has certainly collected some very interesting cases on its behalf. We are not prepared to agree with her philosophy, but whatever it be that exerts a powerful influence upon the mind, may, if that mind be well directed, be turned to good account.

Ecclesia. A Volume of Poems. By the Rev. R. H. Hawker. Oxford: Parker. 1841.

These poems are decidedly better than Mr. Faber's, and yet they do not indicate so much poetical power: nevertheless, it is pleasant to find poets springing up around us to fill the places of those who, in the natural order of things, must soon cease from among us.

The Romance of Jewish History. By the Misses Moss. London: Churton. 1841. 3 vols.

Our readers will hardly require to be told that we are somewhat slow to notice novels; nor are such greatly recommended to us by any dedication to Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer, who, though a clever man in his way, is pre-eminently a man of the nineteenth century.

In this book of two young ladies of the Jewish persuasion, we find much, however, that attracted us; and though there are many faults, both of style and arrangement, which years and experience will correct, there is yet sufficient merit to induce us to recommend a continuance in the path they have chosen for themselves. "The Romance of Jewish History" is an imitation of "The Romance of English History," by Henry Neele—of "French History," by Leitch Retchie—and of "Indian History," by Hobart Caunter—and we are bound to say, by no means an unsuccessful one. We find objections have been made on the ground that the Hebrew history is of too sacred a character to be romanticized: we can only say that while we fully appreciate the objection, an attentive perusal of the tales before us will prove that the Misses Moss have steered perfectly clear of the error in question; they have taken the episodes of Jewish history, and worked them into very pleasing narratives, with a properly preserved costume,—there is much in this. Altogether we look on these volumes as giving a fair promise of future excellence.

---

1. *The Works of Josephus.* Parts 9 and 10. Pictorial Edition. Virtue.
2. *Fox's Book of Martyrs.* By the Rev. J. Cumming, M. A. London: Virtue, 1841.

The former of these two works, of which we have already expressed our favourable opinion, is proceeding towards a close, and we are happy that we can continue our praise. The latter is a new undertaking, and will be a good book for reading, though not intended for reference. It is peculiarly seasonable in these days of semi-popery.

Ireland. By N. P. Willis. Parts 1 and 2, London: Virtue. 1841.

We are glad to see this work; it will prove not only more intrinsically beautiful, but more generally interesting, than the Canadian and American scenery, which it succeeds. These were beautiful; and our remarks mean not that we admire Canada less, but that we admire Ireland more.

Helen Fleetwood: a Narrative. By Charlotte Elizabeth. London: Seeleys. 1841.

It is a great pleasure, and one not a little enhanced by its novelty, to speak in terms of approbation of this lady's writings. In the volume before us we have nothing to object, save that, characteristically enough, the office of the clergyman is deputed to the "doctor and nurse, and a great many more." Let us pass over this, and acknowledge, which we can do with great pleasure, that the book is a pleasing and a profitable one. We rejoice to see another protest against the factory system, and we wish well to all who take up this holy crusade. Charlotte Elizabeth will see from these remarks, that our strictures on many of her former publications were made unwillingly; and that we are glad when we can discontinue them.

Pulpit Recollections; or, Miscellaneous Sermons preached in the Parish Church of Stoke-upon-Trent, Staffordshire. By the Rev. Sir William Dunbar, Bart., S.C.L. London: Smith and Elder. 1841.

We have long known the amiable and truly pious author of these excellent discourses; at Stoke-upon-Trent, in Staffordshire, he worked a wonderful reformation among his rude parishioners. Since then he has been equally successful at the "Sailors' Home;" and it is with no small delight, knowing these things, that we find embodied in the admirable volume before us those lessons which its author has so nobly practised. Sir William Dunbar has not yet reached the middle period of life; we hope, therefore, for many years to trace him in his useful and honourable course, and from time to time to hear of him by means of the press. That it will not be unprofitable, the sermons here published give promise.

The Restoration of the Jews to their own Land, in its connection with their Conversion and the Final Blessedness of the Earth. By the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, M.A., Rector of Watton, Herts. London: Seeleys. 1841.

When the Jewish question was first taken up by "the religious world," as it is called, it was at once seen that it was more a practical than a merely theoretical question. Among those who have most effectually taken it up has been Mr. Bickersteth. The present volume is an able collection of sermons and other papers, very well digested into a continuous treatise.

Home Discipline. London: Burns. 1841.

A book small in size, but containing much valuable matter. Rightly does the authoress lay the foundation of all true education, and all domestic felicity, in the precepts and practice of our holy religion.

Fasts and Festivals of the English Church. London: Burns. 1841.

HERE we have a "Nelson made easy:" a very good book in its way, but of which little need be said. We are always glad to see the usages of the Church defended, and her ritual made intelligible; but we are unceasingly cautious in recommending books which probably emanate from Oriel College. All we can say in the present instance is, that we see no cause for distrust.

Collier's Ecclesiastical History. By Francis Barham, Esq. Vols. 8. and 9. London: Straker. 1841.

THIS great undertaking is at length brought to a close, and highly is it creditable to the enterprise of Mr. Straker and the judgment of Mr. Barham. Our limits forbid us at present to do more than acquaint our readers with the fact, that they may now procure the complete work. In our next number, we purpose to consider, more at length, the merits of Collier and this particular edition.

A Visit to the Indians of Chili. By Captain Gardiner, Author of "A Narrative of a Journey in the Zulu Country." London: Seeleys. 1841.

WE purpose shortly to make some remarks on the general state of South America, and the openings there to be found for the introduction of Catholic—not Romanized—Christianity. We shall then recur to the very interesting narrative of Captain Gardiner—a book which all who wish to understand what a missionary spirit means should immediately procure and read.

---

1. *Prayers for Young Persons.* London: Rodwell. 1841.
2. *What we are to Believe a Practical Explanation of the Creed, for the use of Children.* London. Burns. 1841.
3. *Lessons on the Liturgy.* Compiled from various Authors. London: Rodwell. 1841.

USEFUL compilations for children—the explanation of the creed particularly so.

---

1. *Nuces Philosophicæ; or, Philosophic Nuts. Nos.* 1, 2, and 3. London: Simpkin and Marshall. 1841.
2. *Sunday Reader.* By the Rev. J. E. Riddle, M.A. Nos. 1 and 2. London: Simpkin and Marshall. 1841.

WE shall be better able to decide on these works when we have seen more of them. At present we incline to suspect the former, and to approve the latter.

William Edward Painter, Strand, London, Printer.